

THE CALCUTTA JOURNAL,

OF

Politics and General Literature.

VOL. V.]

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17. 1822.

[No. 223.]

SUMMARY OF NEWS.

—209—

Politics of Europe.

The abundance and variety of information contained in the Papers last received, render it a matter of great difficulty to decide on the articles that have the best claims to early publication. In this embarrassment, every line that is occupied with explanation or comment is so much deducted from the space that is required for actual intelligence; and this consideration, rather than any diminution, of zeal, or abatement of active interest in the public cause, must plead an excuse for the brevity of our introductory remarks.

We have again occupied the Sheets usually devoted to Asiatic subjects with the latest and most interesting articles of European information from the London Papers last received; but shall soon resume our accustomed order of publication. The Shipping Intelligence will be found under its appropriate head, in the last page, and we proceed here with the Selections of General News.

London, Saturday, May 11, 1822.—There has at length been laid before the House of Commons the return of the third class of the Civil List, as it is called—that is, the statement of our Ambassadors at foreign Courts, their salaries, and other expenses. The account is somewhat a confused one. We can, however, extract this consolatory inference from its contents—that our expenses under this head admit of much reduction. “The ground of your present hope, O Athenians,” said the immortal orator, “is your past misconduct: for if by conducting yourselves well you had been brought into this distress, then indeed might you have despaired. But having conducted yourselves ill, and being, in consequence, plunged into calamity, reformation may afford you just confidence of an improvement in your condition.” So it may be said of us by one who surveys the expenses of Government. If, under a frugal system, we had fallen into such penury, our condition would have been hopeless; but, perceiving that it is by most profligate extravagance that we are involved in this distress, there is reason to trust that retrenchment and economy may still save us.

The sum of our expenses for Ambassadors, Envoys, and different kinds of Foreign Ministers in 1792, was 88,346l.: in 1821 it is 171,469l., or nearly double. In every department of Government there is the same extravagance discovered. It matters not in what office inquiry may be directed, something is sure to be discovered to afflict and provoke a suffering people. In 1792, the general expenses of the French embassy were 9,450l.: now they are 14,555l. At the former period, the Austrian Envoy and his establishment cost 5,300l.: now, our no-Ambassador at that Court consumes 14,989l. Our Envoy Extraordinary at Lisbon in 1792, was 3,432l. now we have only a Secretary of Legation, who yet expends for us 2,299l. About Switzerland there is some confusion. We recollect that Lord KING, when speaking some time ago of the miraculous young Mr. WYNN, who is to “lard the lean earth” of Switzerland, with British “fat,” spoke repeatedly of the diplomatic duty having been adequately performed there for 250l. a year. We observe, however, by the return, that we had in Switzerland, in 1792, a Minister Plenipotentiary at 1,575l. per annum. On the return of peace,

there was only a Secretary of Legation at 500l., who, as *Charge d’Affaires*, received about 1,095l. more, making in the whole, with 422l. incidental, 2,017l. This was pretty well. But now comes the appointment of the young ministerial recruit—HENRY WATKIN WILLIAMS WYNN, Esq. The deuce take fellows with long names, we say. It is astonishing how much peculation has been committed upon the public by single men carrying the appellations of, at least two from their baptisms. We should treat them, on the part of the nation, as the peasant did the Spanish nobleman who called for admission in a storm, declaring at the same time his various titles:—“Gentlemen,” replied the astonished listener from his window, “our’s is a poor cottage, and cannot contain half of you.” HENRY WATKIN WILLIAMS WYNN, then, is to receive, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Swiss cantons—in salary, 3,900l. per annum; outfit, 1,500l.; Secretary of Legation, 500l. per annum—sum total for first year, 5,900l.!!! Why was the odd hundred modestly slipped off? Why not 6,000l. a year? We have, however, said all that needs, we trust, upon this shameful appointment. We hope that this is the last time that it will be heard of; and that we are now only recording a defeated attempt to plunder the people—an action which is not fated to be what the schoolmen call “*in esse*.”

The proposed meeting between the monied gentlemen on the one side, and the FIRST LORD of the TREASURY with the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER on the other, took place yesterday. It will be seen that the South Sea Company were thrust forward into the post of honour, for taking up the new loan. Nothing, however, is as yet decided. There was a meeting of the South Sea Proprietors, after the meeting at the Treasury Chambers: but the novelty of the scheme seemed to keep a Company possessing no great commercial activity in suspense; and small progress was made either in assent or dissent. We should not wonder if the scheme failed! Had the Company in question possessed funds of its own, more than adequate to the loan proposed, then little account would have needed to be taken of the dissentients; but where the original funds are deficient by more than a third, the dissentients *must* tell. And who are likely to be the dissentients? All those, we should think, whose time of life cuts short the hope of distant wealth, and who are therefore more anxious to enjoy their present fortune as they have been used. It will be seen by an observation in Lord LIVERPOOL’s speech, that he is not quite confident of the success of the scheme on the terms at first expected by Government. There is to be another meeting at the Treasury Chambers on Tuesday next, and of South Sea Proprietors on Monday next.

There was yesterday a meeting of the African Association. The friends of humanity will be shocked to find that the horrid traffic in our fellow-men is still carried on with great and increased activity by our neighbours.

We rejoice to see the success of the subscription for the relief of the distressed Irish: the promptitude, also, with which the Committee have despatched sums to the unhappy sufferers, deserves the highest commendations. The persons constituting the Committee are of the highest character and respectability. We trust they will look closely to the application of the nation’s bounty.—*Times*.

English Catholic Peers.—The present number of English Catholic Peers is seven—viz. the Duke of Norfolk, Earl of Shrewsbury, Lords Stourton, Petre, Arundel, Durmer, and Clifford. Eight Irish—Earls of Fingall and Kenmore; Viscounts Gormanston, Netterville, Taaffe, and Southwell; Lords Trimleston and French. Two Scotch—Earls of Newburgh and Traquair. In all seventeen.

Intelligence from Smyrna.—We have received German Paper to the 2d inst. They contain the following intelligence from Smyrna, of an alleged act of barbarity committed by the Turks in the Island of Chios, which was the cause of a revolt that terminated in the loss of the island:—

"Extract of a letter from Smyrna, dated April 5.—The excesses daily committed by the Turks against the Greeks on various parts of the coast, had induced a great number of Greeks of Asia to take refuge in the Islands of Chios, Mitilene and Samos, where the Turks being less numerous, still preserved severe measures in their treatment of the Greeks. At Chios, for instance, the Turks contented themselves with choosing twenty-seven of the principal inhabitants of the capital for hostages, whom they shut up in a fort near the sea, the only place which they occupied in the island, where all the inhabitants are Greeks. At Samos, the Greek refugees from Asia united with the brave Samio's, conscious of their strength, and having found in Lyeurgus a chief equally brave and prudent, had succeeded, so far back as December last, in freeing themselves from the Turkish yoke. The island of Mitilene is still kept in subjection by several fortified castles, and by a greater number of musleman inhabitants. Several inhabitants of Chios, equally distinguished by their wealth and superior education, had withdrawn as soon as they saw the Turks, at their discretion, choose hostages, among the richest of their countrymen. They went to Samos, to join the free Greeks of that island. These generous fugitives from Chios soon learnt that the Turks had massacred the twenty-seven Greek hostages confined in the fort at Chios, and that they had shut themselves up in it, giving out that they had punished with death only one of the hostages. Confounded by the information of the new measures of the Divan, withheld also by the Greek archons, or chiefs of the island, who are highly favoured by the Turks, and by the interest of the extensive commerce which they carry on with the capital of the Empire, the inhabitants of Chios did not venture to rise, and take vengeance for the new crime committed by the Turks almost before their eyes. But their brave countrymen, who had taken refuge at Samos, having equipped a small flotilla, provided with artillery, and manned by 3 or 400 Samio's, soon landed on the Isle of Chios, where they hoisted the banner of the Cross. Immediately all the inhabitants flew to arms, and assisted in landing the artillery of the flotilla near the fort, in which the small garrison of the island was shut up. Batteries were immediately erected, trenches opened about the fort, which, though near the sea, may be invested by land, Men, women, and boys—the whole population of the Island, assisted in digging the trenches. Soon the artillery was directed against the fort, after a previous offer made to the Turks, to let them retire to Asia, if they could produce the hostages. But their refusal being considered by the inhabitants as a confirmation of the massacre of their countrymen, nothing could equal the indignation of the besiegers, and there is reason to suppose that none of the Turks shut up in the fort will escape the just vengeance of the Chio's, because this fort, which was built while the Island was in possession of the Venetians, cannot hold out long. It is thus, by a new act of gratuitous cruelty, that the Turks have lost the richest, the most industrious, and best governed island of the Archipelago. This loss will be felt at Constantinople, which drew from Chios all kinds of articles for clothing and ornament, the workmen of all descriptions in this island being considered as the first in Turkey. Chios has also long possessed a celebrated Greek school and a printing-office."—*Courier*, May 12.

Toleration.—A writer in the last Number of the *New MONTHLY* gives a very interesting account of the State of Religion in the

Highlands of Scotland. He says, "Protestants and Papists, so often pronounced, to be eternally inimical, live here in charity and brotherhood. On neither side is humanity forgotten in their doctrine of Divinity. The world, it is hoped, will soon understand, that distinctions in worship do not necessarily imply distinctions in our nature; and that our fellow-beings of opposite religious are as capable of love and friendship, of benevolence and sympathy, as those who kneel on the same hassock or chant the same psalm. In Fort William, there is the Scotch Church and the Episcopal and Roman Catholic Chapels. The inhabitants know no division, except at the doors of their respective places of worship."—The philosophic observer adds in a note—"Pennant, speaking of the island of Cannay, says, 'The Minister and the Popish Priest reside in Big, but by reason of the turbulent seas that divide these isles, are very seldom able to attend their flocks. I admire the moderation of their congregations, who attend the preaching of either indifferently as they happen to arrive. As the Scotch are economists in religion, I would recommend the practice of one of the little Swiss mixed Cantons, who, through mere frugality, kept but one Divine,—a moderate, honest fellow, who, steering clear of controversial points, held forth to the Calvinist flock on one part of the day, and to his Catholic on the other. He lived long among them much respected, and died lamented.'—Mr. Mathews likewise, in his *Diary of an Invalid*, describes Switzerland as a country 'where the bitterness of religious differences is softened by the kindly feeling of human brotherhood.'—But this character is not peculiar to mountaineers, as it belongs equally to the inhabitants of the United States. What a lesson to other countries!"—The account this intelligent writer gives of the Highland custom of administering the sacrament in the open air, to assembled thousands, "in the midst of a wild and rugged tract of mountains," strikes us—"('albeit unused to the pious mood,')—as being an impressive picture of rural faith and simple ceremony.—Such a scene seems to us infinitely more grand than any which was ever exhibited at St. Paul's or St. Peter's:—and so thinks one of our very ablest Poets:—

"My altars are the mountains and the ocean,
"Earth, air, stars,—all that springs from the great whole,
"Who hath produced and will receive the soul."—BYRON.

Simplicity in Diet.—As soon as old Parr came to change his simple homely diet to that of the Court and Arundel-house, he quickly sunk and dropt away; for the stomach easily concocts plain and familiar food, but finds it a hard and difficult task to vanquish and overcome meats of different substances; whence we so often see temperate and abstemious persons, of a collegiate diet, very healthy; husbandmen and laborious people more robust and longer lived than others of an uncertain extravagant diet.—*Evelyn*.

Southampton, Saturday, May 4, 1823.—Died, at his house, at Southampton, on the 25th February last, Major-General Maddox Richardson, Governor of North Yarmouth, to the inexpressible grief and deep regret of his family, and of all that knew him. His manners, even to the advanced period of his amiable life, were cheerful, unaffected, and engaging; he was always admired for his manliness of conduct, evenness of temper, and frankness of manners, and ever highly esteemed by his brother Officers, and by the soldiers that served under his command. He had the Honour of being particularly noticed and distinguished by his late Majesty George III. Major-General Richardson was in the undermentioned Battles and Actions:—Warburgh, 31st July, 1760; the Surprise of Zerlinburgh, 5th September, 1760; Battle of Compen, 10th October, 1760; Action of Vellinghausen, or Kirk Dunkirk, 15th and 16th July, 1761; Action of Williamstad, the 24th June, 1762; and of Ewtaw's Springs, in America, the 8th September, 1781—He also served in Gibraltar and Minorca, and for five months as a Captain of Marines, on board of a man-of-war in the Russian Armament, although, at that time, he held the rank of Lieutenant Colonel in the British Army.

Treasury Meeting.—On the morning of the 10th of May, at 11 o'clock, the Governor of the Bank, several of the Bank Directors, the heads of several of the Insurance Companies, and a considerable number of the monied men of the city assembled at the Treasury-Chambers, Whitehall, to meet the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the subject of the proposed contract for advancing money to pay the naval and military pensions. The object of the meeting was to hear such explanations of the plan submitted to Parliament as might be requisite for understanding its details, to discuss such modifications of it as might be suggested, and to ascertain if any individuals or companies were prepared to offer themselves as contractors in pursuance of the appointment made on the 7th of May.

Previous to the public meeting, the Governor and some of the Directors of the Bank of England had a private interview with the Earl of Liverpool and the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The gentlemen present were not so numerous as on the former occasion.

The meeting having been introduced to the Council Chamber, the Earl of Liverpool, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Governor of the Bank of England, shortly afterwards entered the room.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL then said, that they were desirous of knowing from the gentlemen present, many of whom he recognized as having been in attendance at the last meeting, whether they had considered the plan that had been proposed—whether they wished any further explanation—or whether any of them were ready to state that they would become bidders?

A short pause ensued, no answer was given, and no gentleman seemed disposed to make any observations.

Mr. GRENELL then begged to be informed if any alteration had been made in the plan?

Mr. VANSITTART replied, that a few insertions had been made for the purpose of making the plan more clear, but no alteration had taken place which affected its general character.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL then read the plan over again, pointing out the insertions to which Mr. Vansittart had alluded. The only material change was in the paragraph referring to the "deposit of 500,000*l.* in Exchequer bills, to be lodged in the Bank of England within three days after the signature of the contract:" and here it was added, that the deposit might consist of 60,000*l.* three per cent. Consols.

Mr. VANSITTART wished to know whether it was thought desirable to fix any other day than Tuesday for receiving the biddings?

The answer was in the negative.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL.—Then, in the first place, we are desirous of being informed whether any body is disposed to contract for the whole.

Mr. ROTHSCHILD.—I do not think any lists have been prepared in the city. If any offer is to be made, therefore, it must come from a company.

Mr. BOSANQUET, the Governor of the South Sea Company, now observed, that a statement had been prepared by the Directors of the South Sea Company, to lay before the proprietors of South Sea Stock this day. Whether the plan there promulgated would be adopted by the proprietors or not, depended of course upon them—he could not give the least opinion on the subject. Whether they would choose to consent to the suggestions of the Directors or not, rested entirely with themselves.

Mr. VANSITTART.—Then you are not prepared to submit any offer to us on the part of the South Sea Company now?

Mr. BOSANQUET.—Certainly not. The resolution which we have to propose may be carried in the negative. In that case the result may be communicated to-night. If it should be carried in the affirmative, we should require a longer time than Tuesday next to obtain the necessary subscriptions towards the increase of capital which will be required. Many of the pro-

prietors reside at a distance, and time should be allowed for them to signify their opinion.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL.—It is material that Mr. Bosanquet should have a copy of the plan as amended.

The plan was accordingly handed to him.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL.—We are to understand, if you make any proposal, it will be for the whole?

Mr. BOSANQUET.—For the whole.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL.—We are of course desirous of hearing parties who may bid for the whole, in the first instance. If it should turn out that no party bids for the whole, then will come the consideration of the propositions of those who may bid for a part.

Mr. BOSANQUET wished to know whether it was requisite that the bidders for the whole should finally come to their determination by Tuesday morning?

Mr. VANSITTART said, that for many reason it was desirable to close the contract as soon as possible.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL.—It is very desirable that the whole thing should be settled as expeditiously as may be, to prevent the fluctuations which must affect the money market while the matter is in doubt.

Mr. BOSANQUET remarked, that it was probable, in the course of the afternoon, he should be enabled to ascertain the disposition the South Sea proprietors on the subject.

It was intimated by Mr. VANSITTART, that any party who did not now signify their intention to bid for the whole, would not have an opportunity of doing so hereafter; but upon subsequent reference to the Governor of the Bank of England, as to the practice in such cases, was agreed that no objection it would be made to such a bidding on the future day fixed upon for bidding, even though no intimation were now given of such intention.

Mr. BOSANQUET said, that no party not incorporated, and without the power of issuing bonds, could well become bidders.

The Earl of Liverpool said this would make no difference, as he should have no difficulty in recommending to Parliament to give those powers to any party contracting, who could give the requisite securities.

Mr. VANSITTART observed, that if any other parties had it in contemplation to bid for the whole, they ought to signify their intention before Tuesday. It now appeared that no bidding was intended for the whole, except that on the part of the South Sea Company.

Mr. GRENELL said, that as in the course of the day Mr. Bosanquet would ascertain the probability of the South Sea Company agreeing to the plan to be proposed to them, it might be as well to defer fixing the day for receiving the biddings till their intention was known.

Mr. WOOLLEY remarked, that without incorporation no party could bid for the contract; and none of the insurance offices could, as they had no property on which there was not a lien.

Mr. ROTHSCHILD was of opinion that the South Sea Company could best take the contract, as, in co-operation with the Bank of England, every thing might be arranged in a satisfactory manner. He thought that the day already fixed for receiving the biddings ought not to be altered. This was necessary to calm public agitation. He was a proprietor of South Sea stock, and he knew this was the feeling of many others similarly situated.

Mr. ROTHSCHILD then addressed the noble Earl and the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the subject of the Five per cents. He said that several dissenters, who wished to receive their capital now, could only do so by forfeiting the portion of dividend due upon the current quarter. He begged leave to suggest the propriety of their having the portion of interest due up to the moment of their claiming their money, and not being compelled to wait until July or forfeit the whole dividend. (*This gentleman spoke*

so low, that we might possibly have misunderstood him, but we think we are correct.)

Mr. VANSITTART replied, that he saw no objection to the course recommended: it was quite in the spirit of the intentions of Government, and he would write to the Bank of Ireland, and also prepare a notice to the same effect for this country.

After some further observations, it was ultimately fixed by the Earl of Liverpool, that the next meeting should stand fixed, as already appointed, for Tuesday, when the arrangement with the South Sea Company will be made, or the biddings of other parties, if any, received.

It was distinctly understood, that individuals who may be desirous of bidding for the whole contract, shall not be precluded from doing so on Tuesday, if they shall feel so inclined.—*Times*.

London, May 5, 1822.—In the absence of positive intelligence from Petersburg, the ministerial Journals attempt to revive the hopes of peace, and to throw discredit on the previous accounts from Constantinople. No doubt more than sufficient time has elapsed since the Russian Court received the defiance of Turkey, for the former to have made its Declaration; but, as the CHRONICLE has observed, nothing is more improbable than that Russia would give her adversary an important advantage by declaring before she could act. It would indeed be a strange contradiction to the policy Alexander has strictly pursued all along in this affair;—that of bringing troops to the very point of attack, and making the most extensive preparations (which still actively continue) while his professions of peace and good-will were earnest and reiterated. A wily modern despot ever speaks you well, till the moment comes for cutting your throat.

We are exhilarated this week by the arrival of the Grecian ACT OF INDEPENDENCE, issued at Epidaurus, and signed by ALEXANDER MAVROCORDATO, its President, and sixty-seven members of the Congress. It is a very spirited document. The commencement is a vigorous appeal to the feelings of all freemen in approbation of the Greek struggle; and this is followed by an animated reproof of those selfish politicians, who would have sacrificed a whole people, for the sake of some pitiful diplomacy; or to prop up a tottering tyranny a year or two longer. "Public clamours," say these patriot leaders, "little worthy of men born free and elevated in the bosom of Christian and civilised Europe, directed against our cause, have reached us. But why are the Greeks alone, of all Europeans, to be excluded, as unworthy of those rights which God has established for all men? Are they condemned, by their nature, to an eternal slavery, perpetuating amongst them spoliation, violations, and massacres?"—The Congress afterwards removed to Corinth, a well-fortified city, and the key of the Morea.

Lord John Russell's Motion.—The great question of Reform, brought forward by a branch of the truly Noble House of Russell—a son of the Duke of Bedford—has now undergone an evening's discussion in the House of Commons. Lord Russell proposed a simple and specific plan,—a plan which met even the support of the discreet and pious William Wilberforce—so that nothing further need be said, we suppose, of its very moderate, orthodox, and conciliating nature. It was however rejected, as every one thought it would, by the Boroughmongering and Place-holding Majority in that Honourable House;—for the time of acquiescence and reckoning is not yet come. The majority against all Reform was little more than 100. Now let any honest man deduct from these anti-reformers the well-trained band of Ministers,—the Place-holders, Place-seekers, Sinecurists, and their immediate adherents,—and ask whether the necessity for Reform is not at length even felt within the walls of this decidedly aristocratic body? And if within such walls, what must be the desire abroad, among the millions of agrieved, insulted, and almost starving subjects of George the Fourth?—Messrs. Twiss, Canning, Robinson, Wynn,—the whole host, in fact Apostates and Office-holders, little and big denounce the measure as one pregnant with injury to the nation.—Now if the word "themselves" was substituted for "nation,"—nothing would be more true; or certainly a reformed Parliament would not be long in depriv-

ing all such wily political traders of the illmerited and enormous gains which "the system" they are so naturally eager to uphold allows them to enjoy.—After this direct refusal to entertain even such a limited plan of Reform, the "Honorable House" may as well, we think, repeal the laws it has passed to punish with fine, imprisonment, or transportation, all those who may endeavour to bring it into "public hatred and contempt." Bring it into public hatred and contempt! What a needless fear! As if the Walcheren business, the Manchester business, the Queen's business, the Duke of York's Annuity business—the passing of the Six Acts, and the Resolutions making a ragged and fallen Bank-note equal in value to a "golden guinea,"—and if all these things, and many more of a like hateful and contemptible description, were not as familiar to the people as the face of the tax-gatherer, and had not fully established the character of the "Honorable" House!—But Mr. Canning was repeatedly cheered: so no doubt used to be the accomplished Barrington, when he stood forth, in the midst of his circle of followers and participators, to repel the attacks of those who deemed the taking of other men's property a public evil, and the dextrous plunderers public criminals!—As for poor Mr. Wynn, and his headless little Party, after the happy exposure of Lord John Russell, their degradation cannot possibly receive any further addition.—There they are, suspended on the gibbet of public opinion—

"Unrespected, unpitied, unreprieved!"

—And Mr. Wynn in particular may rest satisfied, that, like *Master Bottom* in the play, he may in future speak "in a monstrous little voice," as long and as learnedly as he pleases, without any fear of exciting in the minds of his hearer a contemptuous spirit.

Lord Normanby's Motion.—"Something at all events must be done." This has been for months the exclamation and expectation of the unhappy sufferers under our boasted system of government; and so our country Solomons, seeing that the Session was sliding away, and knowing what their unfortunate tenants were expecting from them, have at length rallied a little, and compelled the Ministry to give up one of the Post-masters General. Well, this is certainly doing "something," for a saving of 2,500*l.* is not exactly nothing; but do these profound Senators suppose that such puny exertions can really lighten the enormous burthens under which the nation is staggering? Their conduct this Session has been all along like that of an old and inveterate gourmand, who, though pressed both by the disease and the doctor (fearful union!) cannot consent to renounce his habitual feasts of venison and turtle, with their "proper accompaniments;" but will only, and that most reluctantly, give up that indigestible little his of stewed mushrooms, their bile-creating fricassee, and occasionally a third point of gout-inflaming Madeira. To "reform it altogether" would, he says, destroy him altogether; so the poor creature goes on with his petty retrenchments and wholesale indulgences, till that grim reformer, *DŒN APOPLEXY*, lays him suddenly on his back—and farewell gourmand! It is pleasing, however, if it be only for the novelty's sake, to see the Ministers in a minority; and it is more than pleasing,—it is absolutely comforting and inspiring,—to behold a young Nobleman like Lord NORMANBY shaking off the prejudices of his caste, and of his immediate connexions (for he is the son of Lord MULGRAVE), and boldly and sensibly standing forth the unfeared, and able and successful advocate, of his suffering countrymen.—Such Statesmen are the salt of the Nobility, which prevents the whole body from becoming offensive to the public taste.—The PROTESTANT CHAMPION, we suppose, was one of Lord NORMANBY's majority, unless, indeed the "eloquence" of Mr. VANSITTART, or some such DEMOSTHENESES, should have charmed him to the other side. Sir THOMAS's hesitation between his sense of duty and his love of oratory, reminds one of the ass between two bundles of hay; both so inviting, that he could make no use of either. If the Baronet is successful in making his votes and speeches harmonize in the ears of his Somerset constituents, all we can say is, that they must be no better judges of concord than were those ancient Swains who preferred the music of MIDAS to that of APOLLO. We shall see.—*Examiner*.

African Institution.

On the 10th of May 1822, the 15th Annual Meeting of the African Institution was held at Freemason's-hall: the attendance was numerous; several ladies (particularly of the Society of Friends) were present. On the platform were his Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester (who took the chair,) the Marquis of Lansdown, Lords Calthorpe, Suffield, Nugent, Belgrave, Gambier; Sir Thomas D. Acland, Sir George Warrender, Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Broogham, Mr. Charles Grant, Mr. H. G. Bennet, Mr. Bootle Wilbraham, Mr. Spring Rice, and several other Members of Parliament. The Rev. Mr. Cunningham (of Harrow,) and many other Clergymen, were also present.

At half past one o'clock, his Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester took the chair, and opened the business of the meeting by calling upon Mr. Harrison, the hon. secretary, to read the 15th annual report, which that gentleman did, and the following are the principal extracts:—After alluding to the afflictive continuance of the slave trade by the subjects of several European Powers, and descanting upon the unparalleled enormities which attended it, and adverting to the motions last year by the Marquis of Lansdown in the House of Lords, and Mr. Wilberforce in the House of Commons, to induce remonstrances with foreign governments to fulfil their treaties upon this subject, the report proceeded to allude to the increase of the slave-trade within the last year. It appeared that during the last year the whole line of Western Africa, from the river Senegal to Benguela, has during that period swarmed with slave-vessels, and an active slave trade has also been carried on upon the eastern shores of that continent, and particularly from the island of Zanzibar. The chief seat of this traffic on the west coast, however, is the rivers Bonny and Calabar; and it has been ascertained on good authority, that in 15 months from July 1820 to October 1821, 190 ships, under different flags had entered the former river, and that 162 had entered the latter, for the purpose of purchasing slaves—a fact which may afford some idea of what must be the dreadful aggregate of misery inflicted during the last year on this unhappy portion of the globe. In this work of iniquity Portugal still takes a pre-eminent part. Portugal, it will be recollected, is the only European Power that has refused entirely to prohibit her subjects from trading in slaves; she retains the guilty distinction of still legalizing a traffic which she acknowledges at the same time to be a crime of the worst description. She engaged, it is true, at the Congress of Vienna, to limit her slave trade to her own possessions south of the Equator. The stipulation, however, has been attended with little benefit to Northern Africa, for it has continued to be most grossly violated by her subjects; and even some of her public functionaries, governors of African colonies, have not scrupled by their own practice openly to sanction the violation. An active slave trade has been carried on between the adjoining continent and the islands of Bissao and Cape de Verde, with the view of the slaves being afterwards shipped to the Havannah, or to the French West India islands. But the rivers which run into the Bight of Benin, and into that of Biafra, are chiefly frequented by the Portuguese slave ships. Many such vessels have, in the course of the last year, been found there by our men of war, completely furnished with all the implements of their cruel traffic, and in a state of readiness to embark their human cargo. The report then goes on to notice, in terms of the warmest approbation, the fact, that throughout the whole range of Spanish America, now become independent, not only has the slave trade been effectually prohibited, but the very incentive to the crime been removed by the gradual abolition of slavery itself, and the declaration that colour is to constitute no bar to the attainment of rank and honours. In allusion to the proceedings of the King of the Netherlands, the report complains of the large introduction of slaves into Surinam, to the number of several thousands, ever since the sitting of the mixed commission there. In allusion to France, the report is as follows:—The directors will now advert to the slave trade carried on under the flag of France, which has maintained during the last, as in some former

years, its guilty pre-eminence. It will appear from the documents inserted in the appendix, that almost every part of the African coast, whether on its western or eastern shores, is crowded with French contrabandists. Although a squadron has been stationed at Senegal and Goree, for the express purpose of suppressing the slave trade, the inhabitants of those settlements are still deeply engaged in it. In other parts of the coast, the British cruisers, wherever they touch, find the French flag spreading its protection over an immense number of slave ships. The coast appears literally to swarm with them: as one instance, in October 1821, Lieutenant Wright, of the *SWAPPER*, during a cruise of only 10 days in the neighbourhood of Cape Mount, fell in with nine slave ships; one was a Dutch vessel, full of slaves, which escaped; the other eight were French, several of them full of slaves. But it is unnecessary to occupy the time of the meeting with these minute details, the enormous extent to which the French slave trade is carried will be found fully attested by the recent communications of Sir Charles McCarthy, of different naval officers, and, above all, of Sir George Collier, the late Commodore on the African station, whose reports on the subject will be read with a deep and painful interest. But the ravages of the French slave traders are not confined to the western shores of that devoted continent. The eastern coast and especially the island of Zanzibar, have recently attracted the cupidity of these lawless adventurers; and an extensive traffic has been carrying on thence for the supply, not only of the Isles of Bourbon, but even of the island of Cuba. A vessel with 344 slaves on board, named *LE SUCCES* was detained in April, 1821, by his Majesty's Ship *MENAI*, Captain Moresby, and carried into the Isle of France, where no claim of possession or property being preferred, she was condemned and the slaves liberated. The correspondence and other documents found on board this ship throw a flood of light on the enormities of this traffic, as it is now carried on by the subjects of France. It will be sufficient to mention, that it appears from these papers that this very vessel, *LE SUCCES*, had already made a successful slave voyage from Zanzibar to the Isle of Bourbon, where she had safely landed 218 slaves; that the Governor, M. Mylius, having been informed of the transaction, had instituted judicial proceedings against her; but that the judges whose office it was to try the cause having themselves participated in the crime by purchasing some of her slaves, concurred in acquitting her; and that, encouraged by this impunity, she was immediately dispatched for another cargo of Africans, and was returning with them to the Isle of Bourbon, when she was detained by the *MENAI*. A variety of other proofs will be found in the Appendix of the pertinacity with which the slave trade is prosecuted under the French flag, as well as of the impunity with which its prosecution is commonly attended. The directors would more particularly refer to the letter of a merchant of Nantes, in which he openly proposes to his correspondents a participation in a slaving adventure, and to the fact mentioned by the Captain of *LE SUCCES*, that at one time twenty-four ships were fitting out at that place for the prosecution of this odious commerce. Even if the penalty of confiscation, the only one which attaches to the violation of those laws, were more frequently enforced than it is, it would do little to arrest the progress of this trade: while the risk of capture and condemnation is so small as to be easily insurable. At present, the rate of insurance does not exceed 15 or 20 per cent, while the gains of the trade are proved to amount to from 200 to 400 per cent. The report then details the unsuccessful effort of the Duke de Broglie in the French Chamber of Peers, last March, to render the laws of France more efficacious against this trade: but the greatest success was anticipated from the diffusion of information upon the subject of the Continent. Most flattering allusions were also made to the conduct of the United States of America, which had made this traffic piracy? and a reference is made to a very elaborate opinion pronounced by Judge Van Ness in one of these cases, which deserves to be recorded. He intimated, that even if this ship and cargo, taken under the Spanish flag, had not been proved to be American property, he would have held that the demand of restitution by the Spanish claimant ought to be rejected, on the ground that the trade, being pronounced illegal and even

criminal by the municipal laws of Spain, and the property being liable to confiscation in the courts of his own country, no Spanish subject could have a right to claim restitution in the courts of the United States. He even went so far as to suggest whether a much broader principle might not now be fairly applied to cases of this description—whether, that is to say, this species of commerce ought not to be regarded as having altogether ceased to be *juris gentium*, and to be treated therefore as wholly out of the safeguard of the law of nations. Another very important document has reached the Directors from the United States. It is the report of committee of the House of Representatives in their last Session, relative to the mutual exercise of the right of search, by Great Britain and America, with a view to the suppression of the slave-trade. This committee gave a very clear opinion in favour of the exercise of this right. The report also states the conclusion of a treaty between Governor Farquhar and the King of Madagascar, for the abolition of the slave trade on that island, and states that Governor Farquhar has been indefatigable in his efforts to suppress the slave trade in the adjacent seas; and he appears to have succeeded in preventing any importation within the limits of his own Government. At the very time that the Board was engaged in a correspondence with the Court of Directors of the East India Company, to induce them to employ their influence with the Imaum of Muscat to put an end to the slave trade, so extensively carried on at Zanzibar, and had the satisfaction of obtaining the prompt and cordial concurrence of that distinguished body, Governor Farquhar, by a singular and gratifying coincidence, was occupied in addressing the Governor General of India and the Imaum of Muscat to the same effect.

The report concludes thus:—

Under these circumstances, they shall exceedingly regret the opening of a free intercourse between the West Indian colonies and foreign States, unless it be made a substantive part of the measure that a register act, not merely a nominal and delusive, but an efficient register act, shall exist in every colony to which the proposed boon shall be extended. While sugars of the West Indies are protected in their monopoly of the home market by a high duty, not merely on foreign sugars, but on the sugars grown in our own East Indian possessions, thus giving a decided and exclusive preference to the produce of cultivation by slave labour over that produced by free labour, the least that can be wished, if not demanded, is, that no means should be omitted which afford a likelihood of effectually preventing the clandestine introduction of slaves into our colonies, or their clandestine removal to the more productive colonies of foreign nations.

Lord CALTHORPE rose to propose the motion of thanks to the Directors of the African Institution. He lamented the inadequate manner in which the efforts of the abolitionists were supported by foreign powers, but he anticipated a more favourable result from the constitutional governments of the continent.

Lord NUGENT, in seconding the motion, animadverted in severe terms upon the odious traffic of the slave trade, and expressed a hope that the time was not far distant, when, by the common co-operation of all civilized governments, a termination would be put to the depredations of that monster of all-mankind—the trader in human flesh.

The Marquis of Lonsdown proposed the 2d resolution, which was declaratory of the abhorrence of the society at the manner in which the slave trade subsisted. He lamented the indisposition which was manifested by foreign power to take the only step that could render the abolition effective, namely, by making it piracy. He congratulated the meeting upon the great example set in this respect by the United States of America, whose government took the proper attitude that it became freemen to assume in the cause of freedom. (*applause.*) The Noble Marquis then referred to the efforts of the Duke de Broglie (whom he was proud to call his friend), in France, and to the recent establishment of a society in that country, having the same object in view as the African Institution. He fully concurred in the necessity of exciting public opinion to a detestation of this traffic on the continent, by publications demonstrating its impolicy and inhu-

manity. When public opinion was enlightened, much might then be done. The only reason he had ever heard urged in France against the enactment of severer measures to enforce the abolition was, that the country was not yet ripe for such severity, and that neither judges nor juries would be found to execute such enactments. There would soon, he trusted, be an end to that argument. (*hear, hear.*) But, at present, it was lamentable that the science of the application of capital, which, by insurance, guarded the enterprising trader, and averted from him ruin and loss, was in France perverted to the iniquitous purpose of securing the inhuman slave trader from the penalties of a daring infraction of the laws of his country. (*hear.*) The Noble Marquis condemned, in the warmest manner, the continuance of this detestable traffic.

Mr. WILBERFORCE, in seconding the declaratory resolution, deeply regretted the necessity which existed of enlightening the public mind of France respecting the odious nature of the slave trade. Fifteen years ago, when their illustrious Chairman had joined in the formation of this society, they vainly thought the question of abolition was set at rest, and that nothing remained but to secure the co-operation of the other powers to execute the prohibitory laws enacted against the crime. Though their anticipation had not been fulfilled, they had yet done much, and had earned that reward which all good men were sure to meet without reference to the success of their benevolent efforts. Independent of the moral necessity for the continuance of their labours, they should never forget that they owed Africa a weighty reparation for the deep injuries which they had inflicted on her unhappy children, and could never stop until they had repaired the evils they had committed. (*hear, hear.*) The honourable gentleman then took a retrospective glance at the progress of their labours; at the advances they had made since the time when the unhappy Africans were declared, even by some historians, to be an inferior class of human beings, not to be classed in the same scale with others. He particularly eulogized the Society of Friends for their uniform efforts in the cause of the abolition, efforts which, he said, had compelled them to violate the modesty of their own feelings, to act in opposition to the principles by which they regulated their conduct, and come forward to assist in the holy work, in open day, in conjunction with their brethren of different religions. He also said, that to the honour of Ireland, her ports had never been defiled by the vessels of this odious traffic—a fact which gave that generous and gallant nation an additional claim in this hour of her calamity to the relief of this country (*hear, hear.*) It was a humiliating fact, that England had, in the slave trade, been pre-eminent in guilt; but it was consolatory to know that she was also foremost in repentance. (*hear, hear.*) So completely had England formerly identified this traffic with her trade, that even when she abandoned it, other nations fancied that it was for the purpose of carrying into effect some new commercial speculation. He then congratulated the society upon the accession of the Duke de Broglie and his friends, who were among the most intelligent and distinguished characters in France, and whose efforts would, no doubt, produce the best results. He adverted, in flattering terms, to the success which had, after a lapse of years, attended the colonization of Sierra-Leone—at first the prospect had been discouraging—so it always was in the history of such improvements. The colony of Virginia, one not undertaken by needy speculators, but at the suggestion of the wisest of men—of Lord Bacon, and partly formed under the eye of Sir W. Raleigh—three times was the colony of Virginia attempted, and as often abandoned, until at length a final trial was made, and complete success attended it. The honourable member eulogized in the highest terms the service of Sir George Collier, and the naval force under his command on the coast of Africa, and remarked that the first intimation of making the slave trade piracy had a very singular origin. It arose from a treaty made by the son of a very old friend of his, Lieutenant Thomson, R. N., with a people in the Arabian gulf, who consented to denounce the slave trade as piratical, although he (Mr. Wilberforce) was afraid they were themselves little better than pirates. (*hear, and a laugh.*)

Mr. BROUGHAM proposed a resolution expressive of the gratification of the society at finding the slave-trade made piracy by the United States of America. In doing so, he was grieved to say, that instead of being assembled, as they had hoped, this day, to witness the consummation of their 15 years' labours in enforcing the act of abolition, they had now the mortification to find a new series of troubles rising to their view from a singular combination of unhappy circumstances. As long as their own laws had to be watched over to be enforced—as long as their own colonies declined to give their own slaves the equal benefit of the law, and withheld from them every thing which was not extorted from the masters, by the necessity of fostering the slaves now risen in price, if that degraded epithet must still attach to human beings—as long as other nations refused to redeem their own plighted promise—so long the American institution must obviously and necessarily have much to accomplish. (*hear, hear.*) It would seem from the interesting report which had been read, that the history of the chief countries of Europe, since the peace, exhibited nothing but a series of pledges given to be forfeited—opportunities of benefiting mankind only afforded to be scandalously thrown away—chances held forth to the nations of the world, but cast aside, of recovering themselves, and of gaining imperishable renown. (*applause.*) He looked with indignation at the contrast presented to these nations by the United States of America, and the still greater contrast presented by the republican subjects of a free country, in the performance where they had not promised so much, to those regal governments which had promised so much, and performed so little. (*applause.*) Too much could not be said of the labours of the Society of Friends, who had been forcibly compelled, by the greatness of their own doings, to encroach upon that meekness of habit which uniformly induced them to

“Do good by stealth, and blush to find it fame,”

(*hear.*) and forced them to receive that public approbation from their fellow-subjects, which they were the first to earn, but the last to claim. (*hear.*) There were, however, some of the foreign governments who resembled the Society of Friends, but it was only in this one habit—that they made no claim for the approbation of mankind. (*laughter.*) If they were slow in claiming, they took an especial care to be also slow in deserving—their modest and retired habits were never broken in upon by the applause of suffering humanity; they kept the left hand in entire ignorance of what was doing by the right, and to obviate the possibility of a charitable exposure, they took particular care to keep both hands idle. (*renewed bursts of laughter.*) These governments stood wholly without excuse, and he would press upon their Governments, if they could hear him—he would press upon their people, through whom those Governments must sooner or later hear it, that vain will be their plea of England's example of indifference to this traffic for a series of years, even if that plea were stronger than it can be pretended to be. True it is that this is the 40th year since the wrongs of Africa first caught the attention of English ear. At that time a small society (principally from among the Society of Friends), 6 in number, of whom alone George Harrison was the survivor, met in conclave upon this traffic. True, their conclave was as secret in its deliberations as were other congresses that had since assembled, though composed of a very different members, influenced by very different feelings, and having very different objects to promote. This society sought information respecting the traffic; they were followed by Thomas Clarkson, and, treading on his heels in the great work, came his hon. friend (Mr. Wilberforce,) who had rendered his name illustrious by his services in this holy cause. (*loud applause.*) And yet, notwithstanding the great exertions of such men, 25 years elapsed from the beginning to the conclusion of their efforts, so far as the passing of the abolition act. Why did he refer to these facts?—first, that they had to take to themselves the deep shame of allowing so many years to elapse in the progress of such a question; and next, to discourage despair, under any present circumstances, by showing, that in whatever cause a free and enlightened people resolve to embark, success must ultimately attend their struggle. (*applause.*) It was not one

year before their final triumph, that after the question of abolition was carried in the Commons, it was flung out in the Lords. (*hear, hear.*) He referred to these facts to discourage despair, not to vindicate foreign powers, or allow their plea of the example of England. When the subject was first taken up in England it was new, its details and atrocities were unknown, the effect of measures was untried; but would it be contended that the powers of the continent could plead that ignorance? Had they not had the benefit of the progressive experience of England? They might, indeed, have come into the discussion at the 11th hour, but they did so with all the advantage of hearing the 10 hours' previous debate, and acquiring all the experience of the past to regulate their decision. (*loud cries of hear.*) They must start, therefore, with us at the present time, and not flatter themselves with the delusive hope, that either among the wise or the good men of future times, they would stand justified in a delay, which in the case of England was without defence, but which in their case would be utterly without palliation. (*applause.*) The honourable and learned gentleman then pronounced a warm panegyric upon the example set by the United States of America, in making the slave trade piracy, and upon Mr. Randolph's great efforts in promoting that act.

The Rev. JOHN CUNNINGHAM seconded the motion in an eloquent speech, which we regret our limits will not enable us to give. He strongly recommended that for the purpose of replenishing the funds of the society, its basis should be extended, so as to make the question a religious as well as a political one.

Mr. RANDOLPH (the distinguished American) then rose to return thanks for this mark of respect towards the United States of America. He said that after the eloquence which had already been displayed upon this great subject, it would be an act of presumption scarcely excusable in any stranger, but unpardonable in him, to intrude his unpremeditated expressions upon them after the able speeches which they had not only heard but felt. (*applause.*) He was, however, impelled by a double motive, which he could not resist, to offer himself for a few moments to their attention. First, to discharge an act of duty in behalf of his native land, in the absence of its official representative—an absence as unexpected by him as it was unforeseen, and which had cast upon him a duty he felt inadequate to perform—that of thanking this meeting for the grateful sense they had expressed towards America, and also to assure them that all that was exalted in station, in talent, and in moral character, among his countrymen, was (as was also to be found in England) firmly united for the suppression of this infamous traffic. (*loud applause.*) It was delightful to him to know that Virginia, the land of his sires, the place of his nativity, had for half a century affixed a public brand, an indelible stigma upon this traffic, and had put in the claim of the wretched-objects of it to the common rights and attributes of humanity. (*loud applause.*) He repeated his thanks to the meeting for the flattering reception they had given him.—(*The plainness of Mr. Randolph's appearance, his republican simplicity of manner, and easy and unaffected address, attracted much attention: he sat down amidst a burst of applause.*)

Mr. JOHN WARRE, M. P. proposed a resolution of thanks to Spain, for the recent vote of the Cortes, which made the slave trade penal, by confiscation and ten years' hard labour at the public works. The honourable member drew a forcible contrast between the present favourable disposition of the Spanish Government, and that last year communicated in the despatches of Sir H. Wellesley to the Marquis of Londonderry.

Mr. BOWRING bore testimony to the altered opinion of the Spanish authorities. He said that the debates of the Cortes upon this subject were last year carried on with closed doors, and an adverse measure carried by the foulest misrepresentation of facts.

A man of venerable appearance here evinced a desire to address the meeting from one of the side galleries: he wore a gold chain and medal around his neck; but the call of the meeting being for.

Mr. STEPHEN, that gentleman rose to propose a resolution of thanks to the new governments of South America, for the ready manner in which they (Columbia in particular) had come forward to abolish the slave trade. He then read a letter from a correspondent, detailing the particulars of the Columbian abolition act; and that on the motion that the children of all slaves born since the revolution should be free at 18 years of age, an amendment was moved to substitute the age of 25, as a recompense for the expence of rearing and educating, which amendment was lost by votes of the Council in the proportion of 10 to 1. The principal South American landholders were also arranging a sort of property-tax, to establish a fund for the progressive emancipation of all the slaves who had not obtained privileges by other means, such as military services, &c. He contrasted the liberal and high-minded spirit of the South American Governments with that of our own colonies, where the wretched infant was still doomed to a life of servitude, and could be torn from his family, and sold in another island, at the will of the owner. (*hear.*)

Mr. W. SMITH seconded this resolution, and enforced the necessity of more effective steps to secure the abolition of this odious traffic.

Mr. FOWELL BUXTON, Mr. BOOTLE WILBERHAM, SIR T. D. ACLAND, and one or two other gentlemen addressed the meeting, and enforced similar topics, in language which we regret we have not space to convey; and his Royal Highness the Duke of GLOUCESTER, in acknowledging the thanks of the meeting, took occasion to introduce the name of an illustrious relative of his, who had also steadily pursued the abolition of the slave trade—he meant the King of Denmark. (*applause.*) His royal highness also stated, that he had the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with General Bolivar, who had promised him, when in England in the year 1808, that the moment the South Americans had acquired their liberty, the slave trade should be abolished. General Bolivar had at least redeemed the promise he had made, (*loud applause.*) His royal highness then communicated an apology from Sir George Collier, who was prevented by a severe illness in his family, from attending the present meeting.

When his royal highness quitted the chair, it was taken by Mr. Wilberforce, and thanks were then voted to Mr. Harrison, the hon. Secretary.

The Meeting did not break up till past five o'clock.

Canterbury, April, 8.—A considerable sensation has been excited in this city during the last few days, in consequence of the sentence passed at the last Maidstone Assizes on 19 unfortunate men convicted of being present at an affray with a party of the Preventive Service in a smuggling transaction, which took place at Marsh Bay, in the Isle of Thanet, in which two were wounded on each side, but none killed. A Petition to the King, signed by the Mayor Aldermen, Common Council, Clergy Gentry, and other respectable inhabitants, nearly to the number of 1900, was immediately handed to Mr. Secretary Peel by the Mayor in person, in favour of these deluded victims; stating the comparative innocence of these wretched men, who were by no means the primary offenders in this forbidden traffic, but labourers, unable to procure work, most of them in a state of abject poverty, and hired for the occasion for a few shillings. *To this no answer was received!!!* Four were executed on Penenden Heath on Thursday last, and their remains brought to Canterbury the same night, accompanied into the city by a procession of several hundreds of the inhabitants, singing funeral anthems, &c. in the most solemn and impressive manner. On Sunday a public funeral took place, when the procession and interment of the bodies were attended by nearly half the population of Canterbury, five or six thousand being computed to be present.

Fifteen remained respited during pleasure, one of whom has since died in prison.—The misery this affair has spread through numberless families is indescribable.—Such are the blessed effects of the system under which Englishmen are at present suffering; it being notorious (at least in this neighbourhood) that honest industry cannot procure even a bare subsistence for the labourer and his family. The prisoners on their trial had no counsel.

United States.

We have seen a curious and interesting paper, purporting to be a statistical view of the commerce of the United States, exhibiting in a distinct and intelligible form the value of all articles of foreign and domestic produce imported and exported between the ports of the United States and of all other countries; together with a statement of the tonnage, foreign and domestic, employed in carrying on that commerce. We shall confine our quotations to two or three points. The sum total of foreign goods imported into the United States during the twelve month ending September 30, 1821, was

In dollars,	62,585,724
The exports of domestic produce	43,671,894

Excess of imports over exports	18,913,830
--	------------

This excess, where it is on the side of the imports of a country over its exports, it has been the custom to call an adverse balance of trade; but we cannot end the observation here. If the whole of the articles of foreign merchandize imported be for home consumption, it is plain that they must be, in some shape or other, paid for by the fruits of domestic industry. A country may have the balance of trade against her with one particular nation, but with the whole world the thing is impossible: for the surplus of imports in one country must be purchased by the profit obtained upon a surplus of exports to some other country. But the imports of the United States during the period referred to by the document under our notice, were not all destined for home consumption. One third of the amount appears to have been re-exported, and in American vessels: to that extent, therefore, she became an *entrepot* for foreign goods, and a carrier for foreign nations. The re-exports of foreign articles from the United States during the year rather exceeded the surplus of her general imports over her native commodities exported; she having re-exported of foreign goods—

In American bottoms	20,710,700 dollars.
In Foreign bottoms	691,798

Total Foreign exports	21,302,488
-------------------------------	------------

The total value of her exports, foreign and domestic, thus appears to have been 64,974,382, exceeding the total value of imports, by the small surplus of 2,338,658 dollars.

There is another fact highly deserving of notice in this official document—we mean the disproportion which exists between the total amount of American and that of foreign tonnage, employed in carrying on the trade of the Republic. The outward-bound American shipping throughout the year exceeded 800,000 tons. The outward-bound foreign during the same period amounted to a trifle more than one-tenth of the native.

We conclude with a brief glance at the trade between the British Empire and the United States. The imports to the United States from all parts of the British Empire, in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, are nearly 30,000,000 of dollars—that is, nearly half the sum total of imports into the Republic;

In exact figures	29,277,939
The exports to this empire are, of produce of the United States	21,918,628
Of foreign produce	4,603,914

Total exports to the British Empire	26,522,572
---	------------

The surplus in favour of Great Britain thus amounts to nearly 3,000,000 of dollars.

As for the shipping engaged in carrying on the direct trade between the United Kingdom and the United States, the proportion seems to be in favour of American tonnage, nearly as three to one.—*Times*, April 13.

PARLIAMENTARY.

—217—

Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FRIDAY, MAY 10, 1832.

ROMAN CATHOLIC PEERS BILL.

On the motion of Mr. CANNING, the Order of the Day was read for the second reading of the Catholic Peers Bill.

Mr. SMYTH rose and said, he felt it his duty to address a few observations to the House on this particular measure, but on the general question he would not say one word. With all the respect which he had for the wonderful talents and splendid eloquence of the Right Hon. Member who had introduced the Bill, yet he could not help looking on this measure as a most extraordinary one. It was isolated and partial. It was also unjust towards the great body of the Roman Catholics, and its principal was exclusively aristocratical; for it went to grant a boon to Peers, while it left the people where they were.—(hear, hear.)—He had paid sedulous attention to the speech of the Right Hon. Mover, and he had sat with considerable impatience, and perhaps alarm, like the Hon. Member for Somersetshire, (a laugh) lest he should be captivated by the voice of the Syren. But if any thing were wanting to the measure of his conviction, it was filled up—if any doubt remained, it was effaced by the speech of the Right Hon. Secretary for the Home Department (Mr. Peel). So closely had he argued that question, so historically had he illustrated it, and so clearly expounded all its merits, that there was nothing to be added to the full and complete conviction with which his mind was impressed. He must confess that the vote of the House had not a little surprised him, more especially as he had heard rumours that the Bill was not sanctioned by the conscientious feelings of those very persons for whose special benefit it was intended. But the Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett), thinking that he could not dissuade the Right Hon. Gentleman from bringing on this question, had thought it more prudent and advisable to express his approbation of it than to move the previous question, as had been expected by many, (hear, and a laugh.) If that Right Hon. Gent. (Mr. Plunkett) had thought it right to bring this measure before the House, why did he not submit the general question at once to the House? and it would have been better as coming with the recommendation of having passed the House last Session, than this one which had no such recommendation. He (Mr. S.) could not but look upon this Bill as a forestallment of the general measure; and it was strange that the Right Hon. Mover could not wait six little months to take the sense of the House on the general question. He was sorry to trespass on the general question, but before he sat down he must express his hope that many Hon. Members who had supported this measure at first, would upon consideration, agree in the propriety of its postponement, until they came to a vote on the general question. The question, as it now stood, was not whether Titus Oates was false or not, whether Charles the Second was a Catholic, or whether the Catholics were unjustly deprived of their privileges or not, but it was, whether because they were Lords they ought to be restored to their privileges *instantly*? But if ever a time should arise when such securities were offered as would be deemed sufficient in the opinion of his Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) and would induce him to relax his opposition, then, and not till then, would he accede to the concession.

Mr. WETHERELL, after some preliminary observations, said he would state the grounds on which he opposed the Bill, and he hoped the House would deem them such as fell specifically within the limits of the present question. It was a principal ground of objection with him that the Right Hon. Mover had thought fit to insulate the particular branch of society, to which the present Bill applied, from the aggregate of the Catholic community.—(hear)—He thought it a hard principle which detached a part in this manner from the whole; and, in a case of general disability, gave but a partial relief. He would state his reasons for opposing this partial isolated, and unjust measure. The Right Hon. Mover had stated as the foundation of his argument in support of the Bill, that the Act of Charles the Second, which excluded Catholic Peers from the House of Lords, originated in what he (Mr. W.) believed to be a fiction—what he would call the huge lie of Titus Oates, and it was also argued that supposing the original cause was true, it had ceased to exist. Another argument was, that the exclusion of the Catholic Peers from Parliament was not of the fundamental principles of the Revolution. He (Mr. W.) was ready to admit that the enactment of the 20 Car. 2. was the popular delirium, the *magnus furor* of the nation at the time of the Popish plot; yet, although the depositions of Oates were false, yet that there was then an intention to re-establish Popery on the part of the Court, there was no doubt; for no sooner was the breath out of the body of Charles, who dared not himself avow such intention, then a message came from the Court of France to know what was the force and thought of the Catholic party. It was therefore no reason that, because the moving cause ceased, the law should be discontinued, because there might be other causes which acquired the continuance of the law, and with which it ought to be commensurate. As to the argument, that the exclusion of

the Catholic Peers was not one of the fundamental principles of the Revolution—if that could be demonstrated, one of the chief grounds of his opposition would be removed, and the man who proved it would have a chance of his humble vote. But he believing it was one of the Revolutionary principles, and he alluded, in support of that opinion, to a letter written in the reign of James the Second, when that Monarch made an attempt to conciliate the Prince and Princess of Orange (hear, hear) with a view to subvert the liberties of the country. The letter was written by pensionary Fagel, who managed the correspondence on the part of their Highnesses, and was in answer to one of Mr. Stewart's, who acted for the King. The Hon. Member then proceeded to read an extract from the letter, which stated that their Highnesses were ready to give their concurrence to the repeal of the Penal laws against the Catholics, providing that those laws were to remain in full force whereby Catholics were excluded from seats in both Houses of Parliament, and the Test Act was maintained for the preservation of the Protestant religion. The Bill of Rights asserted that the Lords Spiritual and Temporal were to be Protestant, in corroboration of his argument was the fact that, at the Revolution, a new Coronation Oath was framed, by which the Sovereign bound himself to defend the Protestant religion. From the Reformation to the Revolution no such oath had been prescribed. The introduction of that oath at the Revolution was therefore another circumstance to prove that it was intended to weave Protestantism into the whole of the system established at the Revolution. Let the House also consider the language of the statute by which the union with Scotland was effected. By that statute it was provided that not only the sixteen Scottish Peers, but the whole body of the Scottish Peers, by whom those sixteen were to be chosen,—that the elected, as well as the electors, must be Protestant. With all his admiration, therefore, for the great talents of the Right Honorable and Learned Gentleman, the Attorney-General for Ireland, he could not allow that admiration, to prevent him from expressing his astonishment that that right honorable and learned gentleman could for a moment maintain the doctrine, that the exclusion of Catholics from the House of Peers was not a principle established at the Revolution. The next point to which he wished to advert was the singularity of the proposition to extricate the Catholic Peer alone from the restrictions to which the Catholics generally were subject. On the common principle, that charity begins at home, he should have thought that a Member of the House of Commons would rather have recommended that the introduction of Catholic Commoners into the House of Commons should precede that of Catholic Lords into the House of Peers. He should have expected a proposition in favour of the plebeian, rather than in favour of the equestrian order. Why were the Catholic Peers to be reintegrated in their lost rights before the Catholic Commoners? There was another great inconsistency in the measure. As the Bill stood, Catholic Lords were to go into the House of Peers without taking any oath; as the existing law stood, no individual could take his seat in the House of Commons without taking the usual oaths. Why this discrepancy? Why was the Commoner to be bound by an oath, and the Peer not? Why were they not both to be equally restored to their privileges? The supporters of this Bill would surely not turn round on their former opinions and maintain, with reference to this point, that there was any difference between the inherent right to legislate which birth gave a Peer, and the eligibility to legislate which every one else possessed. He would ask those who formerly voted for the whole measure of Emancipation, whether they would not be guilty of inconsistency in voting for this particular Bill? Why were all the tests and securities omitted in this Bill which were introduced in the Bills of 1817 and 1821? What had occurred to render the various oaths and securities which were thought necessary then, unnecessary now? Would it not be inconsistent, therefore, for those who had twice voted for qualified and restricted Emancipation, now, without any ground whatever for the change, to vote for unqualified and unrestricted Emancipation? In support of this argument, the hon. and learned gentleman recited the various provisions of security in Mr. Grattan's Bill, and asked why they were not inserted in that before the House? But it was said there was no Popish successor to the Throne at present; and therefore that the securities considered necessary at the Revolution were no longer necessary. It was argued that as the cause had ceased, the effect ought to cease. But what kind of logic was that by which it was contended that because the larger danger was no more, therefore there was no danger? It was true there was no Popish successor to the Throne; but the disposition of the Catholics to possess themselves of undue power still remained. There was another view of the subject which it was expedient to take. If a Catholic Peer had a right *a priori* to a seat in Parliament notwithstanding his religion, why was not the monarch to have a right *a priori* to the Throne notwithstanding his religion? And yet, by the Bill of Rights, the Crown would drop from the head of the Sovereign of these realms if he were seen at mass. Much stress had been laid by the supporters of the present motion, on the small number of Peers who would be introduced into Parliament by its adoption. The principle, however, was the same, whether the number was large or small; and, as to the number, it was by no means insignificant, for there had been frequent instances in which a much smaller number had

considerable influence in the decisions of Parliament. There was no Protestant State on the Continent, from large Austria to small Venice, in which the Catholics had not been subject to restriction. Why was Great Britain to be the only Protestant country in Europe in which these guarantees for the preservation of the civil and spiritual rights of the people were not to be required? It had been said, that the present generation ought not to be alarmed with the old terrors of the Spanish Armada, or of the plot of Titus Oates, but that they ought to have some new and modern cause of apprehension shown to them, before they were called upon to be so vigilant. Those modern grounds of apprehension were not wanting; and in proof of that fact, he instanced the remonstrances of the Congress held in Germany, in 1786, of all the Ecclesiastical States, at which the Emperor resided, against the encroachments of the Pope. It was observed, by the friends of the Bill, that Catholic Emancipation had been advocated by the great men of all political parties—that it had been advocated by Pitt, by Burke, by Sheridan—that it was one of those causes which, as Virgil said—

"Mobilitate viget, viresque acquirit eundo."

But he denied that the present measure was at all similar in its principle to any which had heretofore been proposed.—It was a measure for unqualified emancipation; whereas all the measure which preceded it had been for qualified emancipation. After arguing at considerable length to show that there could be no ground for separating this particular class of the Catholic community from the other classes, the Honorable and learned Gentleman expressed his regret that, with all his respect for the Right Honorable author of the Bill, he could conscientiously concur in it, and concluded by moving, as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time that day six months—*(the honorable and learned gentleman was loudly cheered during the course and at the conclusion of his speech.)*

Mr. WILMOT remarked, that he was desirous of briefly explaining the reasons which induced him to vote in support of his Right Hon. Friend's Bill, because he knew that in so voting he acted in opposition to the wishes of a large and respectable body of his constituents. The Hon. and learned Gentleman had asked, why the present proposition was separated from the question of general emancipation? He did not conceive that he was at all bound to answer that inquiry. All that the House had to inquire was, whether there was any ground for refusing to the Catholic Peers a restoration of their right to sit in Parliament? The Hon. and learned Gentleman has also asked, why securities were not required? He (Mr. Wilmot) would reply, because he could not entertain any wish for security where he could not discover any danger.—The Honorable and learned Gentleman, in the course of his speech, alluded to the coronation oath; he (Mr. Wilmot) denied that there was any thing in the coronation oath which went to restrain the King from giving his sanction to an Act of the other branches of the Legislature, for the relief of his Catholic subjects. By such an Act, the Catholics would be raised to their proper station—that of freemen, without any danger to the Protestant church. It was curious to observe how the question was now argued against the Catholics; no one now attempted to say that the Catholics of the present day were the same in prejudice and in opinion with the Catholics of former times, but it was said that the continuance of the Catholic disabilities was essential to the Protestant church, he however, would maintain that the constitution of this country, founded as it was upon the real principles of freedom, and intended for the common good and liberties of all, would be vindicated, not injured, or endangered by the admission of the Catholics to a charge of its privileges and its rights. It was very little to the purpose to refer to former times; he cared not what were the views of Charles or of James; he knew now that there was no longer a pretender; that whatever danger might have been formerly apprehended, no longer remained; and that, therefore, the Catholics ought to be emancipated. It was in vain for Gentlemen to say that the Legislature had gone far enough, they had gone far indeed—too far to stop. The learned gentleman had talked of anomalies in the bill, but what greater anomaly—what more striking or more dangerous and that which the present state of the Catholic body presented? The dangers apprehended by the Honorable and learned Gentleman appeared to be visionary. Could any man now suppose that the Papal Power would attempt to exercise that influence in civil government which it formerly assumed to do? Was it to be supposed, that if seven or eight Peers were admitted to the other House of Parliament, that they would remain perpetually united—determined on one common purpose, and that purpose the overthrow of the constitution? The honorable and learned gentleman had said, that the Catholic Commons would have cause to feel discontented at the restoration to the Catholic Peers of their undoubted rights; but that was a feeling which the Catholics would reject with disdain; they would feel no discontent, but pride at the measure; it would take no right from them—it would not delay the discussion of their claims—it would not prevent Parliament from considering and finally adjusting the great question of Emancipation, founded, as it must be, on those securities which were necessary, because re-

quired by the country. Different, he confessed, was his notion of security. The security he looked to was a sympathy between the Catholic and the Protestant—a union of the countries founded upon equal rights, the security was much more likely to be lasting than any species of security founded upon technical points, which after all, were likely to prove imperfect and insufficient. He would support the present Bill, because he was convinced that it was a proper measure—because he believed that it would conciliate the people of Ireland—a people for whose loyalty he felt respect, and for whose sufferings he felt compassion; and lastly, because it would restore to a noble and illustrious order of men the rights which their ancestors possessed, and which they had never forfeited by crime or dishonour. He recollected well during a discussion on this question, which took place in the other House of Parliament about eight years ago, having seen a Noble Lord, with his son, a lad about twelve years of age, standing at the bar of the House of Lords. The Nobleman to whom he alluded turned to a friend of his, and said, "The result of this night's discussion will determine me whether I shall encourage or repress the spirit of emulation in this boy's mind."—*(hear, hear.)*—He (Mr. W.) knew not what course that Nobleman took with respect to the education of his child—whether, in moments of despair, he laboured to repress in his mind every noble and aspiring thought, the better to fit him for a degraded and exclusive state, in a country where his ancestors possessed power and honour; but this he knew, that it was unworthy in that House to preserve laws which went to degrade all that was Noble, and to stifle in honorable minds the desire and the hope of serving their country. Neither in a political nor religious point of view was there any real objection to the measure; he would therefore invoke them, in the spirit of the Constitution, to give freedom to those who never forfeited their rights; and in the spirit of religion, to do unto others as they would wish they should do unto them.

Mr. FOSTER said, that until the penal laws were totally repealed, the peace and tranquillity of Ireland would never be restored. But in repealing those laws, the Parliament should take care to carry the mind of the country with them. He denied that the mind of the Protestants was with the present measure. He would support the general measure; but he thought at present that the country was taken by surprise; that the question of securities was evaded. He would therefore vote against the Bill.

Dr. PHILLIMORE said, that with respect to securities, however the House might feel it necessary to impose securities with respect to the Catholics at large, he did not see how they were called for or necessary here. In his mind the cases were very different. On the general question they were to legislate for the Catholic population at large. They were to legislate for the people of Ireland. But here the objects were before them. The Bill went only to place in the House of Lords seven or eight Catholic Peers—men who were known to them all. Who would say that those Noblemen were so dangerous in any way as to render it necessary for that House to enact measures of security or restraint respecting them? The names of every one of those Noble Persons were known to the House—they were all persons who were descended from the most illustrious of the Nobles of this land—men who in their high trust had ever acquitted themselves with honour, with fidelity to the Crown, and advantage to the country. Here the hon. and learned Member entered into an historical detail of the conduct of the Catholic Nobility in former times. When a Bill was sent down from that House to exclude the Protestant Bishops from the Lords, the Catholic Nobles, who then sat in Parliament, were foremost in opposing that measure. The Civil Wars succeeded. Of 300 Nobles who fell in that unhappy struggle, 190 were Roman Catholics. In the time of Elizabeth, Catholics were entrusted by that able and polite Princess with places of the greatest power. Howard of Effingham, a Catholic Nobleman, was selected to command as High Admiral the fleet fitted out to oppose the Spanish Armada—other Catholics held places of scarcely inferior trust—and none of them were ever forgetful of their duty to their Sovereign or their country. The hon. and learned Member next alluded to the case of Lord Strafford, and read an affecting account of the trial given by Mr. Evelyn, who witnessed the whole of the proceedings. Mr. Evelyn indignantly complained that the life of a virtuous and aged nobleman should have been taken away upon the evidence of a witness, whose testimony, with impartial men would not be considered sufficient to hang a dog. When it was said that the Catholic Peers would act with hostility towards the Church of England, what proof of this had they from experience? When the Bill was agitated in the House of Peers in the reign of Charles the First, to exclude the Bishops, how did the Catholic Peers vote? How did the ancestor of the Duke of Norfolk vote on that occasion? What greater possible danger could be apprehended from Catholic Peers than from Peers denying the divinity of our Saviour, or the doctrine of the atonement or professing Presbyterianism—a doctrine much more hostile to the Church of England in many respects than Catholicism, and under which the Church had actually been trampled under foot? As a measure of retributive justice and Christian charity, they were called on to pass the Bill.—*(hear, hear.)*

Mr. W. COURTENAY said, that the true question for the House to consider was whether at the present moment it was fit to pursue the same course of legislation as had been deemed expedient at the time of the exclusion of the Catholic Peers. Without entering into any historical details already referred to, he might say that that system of policy had been applied to the particular events of the time. The Hon. Member then examined the acts of exclusion, and other statutes *in pari materia*, such as that against the Pretender, in order to show that though it was a principle of the Revolution of 1688, to secure a Protestant King and a Protestant succession, no importance had been attached to the point whether the Legislature should be Protestant. If any danger existed formerly, none existed now. He rejoiced to see a system of greater toleration prevail among all classes, and the Annual Indemnity Bill was purposely passed to enable Dissenters of all denominations to sit and vote in Parliament. The army and navy had been opened to Roman Catholics: their Peers might fill the most exalted ranks, and enjoy all the advantages of promotion. In short, they were entrusted by law and every species of power that might be dangerous, yet, refused admittance within the walls of Parliament where they would be subject to control. Surely this was a most strange anomaly.—(hear, hear, hear.)—Looking at the present state of Ireland, it was most important that this Bill should be passed—that those who had hitherto been most unjustly excluded from the benefits of the constitution might feel a common interest, and unite in a common cause. The friends of harmony and tranquillity must be the friends of this Bill. He felt a strong persuasion that the great and general measure was silently making progress towards ultimate success; and he conjured Gentlemen who had not voted, or who having voted still doubted, to consider whether the present was not the precise moment when such a gracious concession ought, for the general welfare, to be made.

Mr. W. PEEL did not believe that the supporters of the Bill on the previous night were aware of the consequences that would ensue if it were passed into a law. The question was not merely whether six or eight Catholic Peers of high character should be admitted into the other House; for if this partial measure were successful, ere long the Catholic Commoners would be introduced into this House, and there would then be no reason why other sects should be excluded. What, then, became of the security of the Protestant Church?—(hear.)—It had been said that the majority of the inhabitants of Ireland were in favour of the measure; perhaps so; but if it were possible to poll the whole population of the three kingdoms, the numbers would be greatly against any concession. He could not tell how any man who hoped for tranquillity could support such a proposition. If the present were the time to admit Catholic Peers, why was it not the time to admit Catholic Commoners; and if so, why had not the Right Hon. Gent. brought forward the general question? Had he (Mr. P.) been a Catholic Peer, he should have objected to the introduction of the separate question, and would not have accepted a boon that was not given to all those who were of the same persuasion. He should be glad to learn why this question was now agitated? Its most sanguine friends could not hope that it would pass into a law.—(hear, hear, from the Opposition side.)—He was satisfied that it could not.—(hear, hear, from the Ministerial side);—and it was only casting an invidious task upon the House of Peers to require them to throw it out.—(much cheering from both sides.)

Mr. WYNN observed, that tho' the Honorable Member for Louth Mr. Foster, has qualified his declaration of the necessity that the claims of the Catholics should be conceded, by saying that the Protestant mind was not prepared for it, yet he hoped that declaration would go far to produce the conviction that was desired. The concession of the Catholic claims was of great importance to Ireland, not only in itself, but as blending with all other measures, for without it every act of conciliation would lose its beneficial influence, and every measure of coercion fall with greater severity. Because the whole measure could not be carried, he should not therefore reject any part of it; and though he concurred at the time in the abandonment of the bill of 1813, because the clause admitting Catholics to the House of Commons had been struck out, he now considered it an act rather of indignation than of prudence. It was said by the Honorable Gentleman who spoke last, that if Catholics were admitted to Parliament, other Dissenters could not be excluded. Why other Dissenters were not excluded.—(hear, hear) which formed a strong argument for the admission of Catholics.—(hear.)—The Honorable Member for Oxford (Mr. Wetherell) had said, that if the seven Catholic Peers were to be admitted to Parliament, the prohibition under which the King was placed of not marrying a Catholic must be repealed. But there was no parity in the cases. Six or seven Catholic Lords would be controlled by the general Protestant voice of 300 other Peers, but the King was the sole depositor of the executive power. It was, however, objected that the King might create any number, even a majority, of Catholic Peers. Now, really, if they supposed that public opinion had no force to prevent such a measure, they might prove the necessity of a qualification of property for the House of Peers. The King, it might be said, when he wished to carry any measure, might create the whole of a

regt. of Foot Guards Peers, and march them in a body to give their votes. There was not one of the powers of the constitution that was not liable to the imputation of this possibility of extreme abuse. There had now elapsed 290 years since the Reformation, for which time the Catholic Peers had sat and voted in the House of Peers, in infinitely greater numbers than they could at present; and if in that time they had been dangerous, or if it could be conceived that at any time during the last 60 years they would have been likely to have given their votes in a manner dangerous to the constitution he would say there was a case made out for securities. The condition of the Catholics in Society was now changed. They were till lately aliens in their native land, they lived as a separate and a distinct class, and no one visited a Catholic, who was not considered as almost a Papist. They were now mingled with the mass of society, and bound together by no common notion in points of policy and Government. Their admission to all the privileges of other subjects would be perfectly safe and desirable, but he should support the smallest measure of concession, proposed as *pro tanto*, an act of justice and policy.

Mr. R. MARTIN began by complimenting the Honorable Member for Oxford (Mr. Wetherell) for the intrepid manner in which he had defended the cause he had espoused. He looked upon him as one of the *Hori-atti*.—(laughter.)—He looked upon him as only one of the *Hori-atti*.—(much laughter.—some Members intimated to Mr. Martin that he had mispronounced the word.) If he had mispronounced it, he was sorry for it, but it was not his fault.—(hear, and laughter.)—He was not surprised at the success that had attended the proposition of the Right Honorable Member for Liverpool; the gigantic powers of his eloquence, and the force of his reasoning, must of course produce a great effect upon the opinions of Members. Deprived of that support, it would not have succeeded. But he had no doubt that the measure would be successful in that House, well warranted as it was by facts, and strongly enforced as it would be by the Right Honorable Gentleman.—(hear, hear.)

Mr. PEEL said, that after the full measure of indulgence which he had experienced from the House, when he had the difficult task of following his Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Canning), it was not his intention then to trespass on their attention longer than for a very few minutes. He rose rather for the purpose of correcting some misconstructions from which he had suffered when he had last had the honour of addressing them on that subject, without the opportunity of disclaiming them, than to prolong the discussion. Before he proceeded to address himself to those points, however, he would refer the argument upon which the Hon. Member for Galway chiefly relied, and deprive him at once of any authority he thought he derived from Sir W. Blackstone. And he must beg of that Hon. Member not to be content for the future with reading only one page of that learned writer's works; and if he would not read the whole work at least to read a chapter through. Had he done that in the present case he would have found, that when Mr. Justice Blackstone spoke of granting further favour to the Catholics, it was confined solely to the execution of the penal laws.—(hear.)—If then he looked at the Act of 1793, he would find that all that Blackstone contended should be granted to the Catholics, was conceded to them by that Act which was an Act of penal relaxation. And if it were possible to summon the dead, according to the Hon. Member's fancy, and that Learned Judge were to vote on this question with the Hon. Member for Galway, he (Mr. Peel) would send for the first volume of his work, and shew him that he would give a vote inconsistent with his own declared principles and opinions. He would turn to that part where he said in terms, that one of the great bulwarks of our Constitution was the Act which excluded the Roman Catholics from sitting in Parliament.—(hear, hear.)—That opinion was not upon the penal exclusions of the Catholics but to their exclusion from the Legislature.—hear;—He then proceeded to touch upon the point for which he principally rose. He did understand his Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Canning), at the conclusion of that able and beautiful speech by which he introduced this measure on a late evening, to speak something to the following effect:—"I give you warning that if on this subject you oppose my argument, by entering into discussion upon the general measure, I shall consider this particular question as carried." Now he (Mr. Peel) did meet the question as this Right Hon. Friend wished that he should—he did not argue the general, but confined himself to the particular measure introduced by his Right Hon. Friend; and after so doing, he certainly did not expect that he should be taunted in the reply, with not having met the question on the grounds of justice and liberality.—(hear.) He had said that whilst he opposed the partial measure, he made it no part of his opposition to the general question. Not that he would allow any one who might vote with him to suppose that the rejection of this measure would in any degree diminish his opposition to the general, when that came to be discussed by the House. He admitted, that from the reception this Bill met with, he could not expect so much opposition to the general measure. When that came forward it might be carried, but it did not follow because he held that opinion he should as all diminish his opposition to it. There might be overwhelming majorities,

but he could not retrograde. It was the beauty of our Constitution that we were able to retain our opinions to the last, whatever they might be met by. But upon this he must insist, that if the general measure were likely to be carried, when next brought forward, the arguments in favour of this partial one were *pro tanto* weakened. In proportion as this was probable, he deprecated this partial Bill. The outline of the argument upon which he relied to substantiate this was, that supposing the House taking a different view of this question than he did, should determine upon general principles to remove the disabilities under which the Catholics laboured, he would then have another duty, distinct from opposing that determination, to perform. (*hear*) That duty would be to create as little evil by the discussion as possible; and to make the arrangement, into which he assumed the House to be willing to enter, as complete as possible. (*hear*) That would clearly be his interest in such posture of affairs, and therefore it was, the House would perceive, he was fully justified in deprecating this partial agitation of the question. And he must here say, that it was perfectly fair on his part to unite with him on the present occasion those who might not agree with him upon the general question; and if he thought that this measure was likely to prejudice the general question, as respected the securities which ought to accompany any extension of power to the Catholics, he had a right to appeal to them to support him and reject the present Bill. He did not object to these merely because it was a partial measure. He had said last Session that he was ready to assent to a Bill which should open to the Catholics the avenue to many places of profit, and indeed to all except the Bench. The reason of his objection to this measure was, that it was partial in its operation, but general in principle, and that he repeated was the ground of his objection, and not merely because it was a partial measure. If it were right that disabilities should be taken off six or seven Catholic Peers, they ought to be taken off the whole body of the same persuasion. Here he must observe that it was not a fair way of arguing the question, to argue it upon individual merits, and to say, "Look at the Duke of Norfolk, Lords Arundel and Clifford; look at the characters of these men, and say if you have any thing to fear by removing their disabilities." Would not any one in possession of his ordinary senses see that this was full of sophistry? The question was not, whether six or seven individuals should become privileged; but whether one part of the Legislature should be endowed with a power which the other did not possess. The question was whether the house of Peers should have the power to put a certain number of Catholic Peers into their body, and that the commons should not. His Learned Friend (Dr. Phillimore) said, that the reason why he thought they ought to vote for the removal of the disabilities from the Catholic Peers first was, that those disabilities were imposed upon them last. If that argument was good for any thing it was to remove the same disabilities from the Throne. (*hear, hear*). The argument was good for nothing else, for the last quarter upon which their disabilities were placed was the Throne. Another argument, used by the Learned Civilian, was in the same predicament,—instead of supporting, it opposed his cause. He referred to the favour shown by Queen Elizabeth to Catholic Peers in allowing them to remain in the possession of their hereditary right as Peers, and also in her employment of the Marquis of Winchester as Treasurer. If this argument went to shew any thing, it went to shew that they ought to follow the example of Elizabeth, and not only remove the disabilities to sit in the house of Peers, but also to take office. If they were to give to the Catholic Peers that influence over the House of Peers which his Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Canning) possessed in that House, surely it became them seriously to consider whether they ought not also to consider whether they should not give power to the Crown to employ their talents in office. The securities had not been touched upon in the last discussions, and indeed that subject had better have been left alone than mentioned in the slighting way in which it had been noticed that night. It was now plain that the object of this partial measure was to evade the subject of securities altogether. They were now told that it was merely to calm certain ancient worn-out bigotted Protestants; that securities were even thought of. (*hear*). Their security was to be the concession of this very power, and in proportion to its amount was their security great. What answer would they meet with next Session when they asked for securities? When the Catholic Commons demanded admission to their body, and quoted this concession of power to Catholic Peers without any security of any kind, would it not at the least be invidious to ask them for securities? Their opponents could then tell them, referring to this Act, that at this time they gave distinct notice that they regarded security as nothing important. But with regard to the Bill itself, his comprehensive title was no part of its recommendation. There was, however, one point about it which, manage as he could, his Right Honorable Friend would find it extremely difficult to get over. This was, that the Bill was neither more nor less than a measure to relieve the House of Peers from the necessity of taking the Oath of Supremacy. Now, as far as authority went in favour of this oath, he had a host in support of it. All those on the other side of the question, Mr. Greville, Mr. Ponsonby, and Mr. Pitt, would never

have parted with this security.—Indeed the Bill of last Session, not content with that oath, actually introduced another Oath of Supremacy. On this part of the measure he appealed to all those gentlemen in that House who usually stood forward on constitutional questions. He reminded them that the great Leaders of the Revolution of 1688 actually recongized and insisted on that oath in the Bill of Rights, the great Charter by which William accepted the Throne. This was enacted to be permanently and for ever the law of this realm. It came then to this important question, whether the House of Peers was to be exempted from the Oath of Supremacy, and the House of Commons not? There was no other objection in the bill. It stated, as the ground of the Act, that the Act of the 30th of Charles II. was enacted for causes and circumstances, which now no longer existed.—His Right Honorable Friend the other night said, that the Lords were to be considered as in durance at the time of passing this Act, from the sway held over their minds by the falsehoods of Titus Oates. He (Mr. Peel) had met that argument, by admitting the falsehood of Titus Oates; but he maintained that other causes existed to warrant, and which, in fact, did cause the passing of this Bill. But, supposing they did no longer exist, were they to part with guards, because the causes and circumstances which called them forth were gone? Yes, they must part with some of the best securities of the Constitution. The Constitution never was formed *a priori*. (*hear, hear*)—Persons did not meet and frame securities beforehand. But were they, therefore, to throw down the firmest bulwarks of their liberties because the causes and circumstances which dictated them were gone?—Was he bound to shew the state of mind under which Henry the Eighth did certain acts—why he one year wrote a book—"adversus Martinum Lutherum," and the next was a strong opponent of the Romish Church? The cause which gave rise to the Septennial Act was gone. But if that argument was a sound one, what became of the exclusion of Catholics from the Throne? Did the causes for that part of the law exist now—were there any fears of a Catholic successor? Why then were they to continue to restrict a Monarch from the right and privilege of the meanest of his subjects to choose for the partner of his bed and fortunes, the being that pleased his state? He opposed this Bill, because he thought it would lead to the success of the general measure; because he thought the carrying of this partial measure would lead to the abandonment of the securities. Let him, however, guard the House against supposing that he opposed it because it was partial, or that he wished to entrap one vote under the idea that he would oppose the general measure less strongly when it came. He opposed it not only because he was a friend to the Monarchy, but because he was equally a friend to the democracy; and he implored those who stood forward for the privileges of the people, to consider whether it was decent or proper that they should originate such a measure. He implored them to consider whether it was consistent that they, the Representatives of the People, should come forward to remove disabilities from the House of Peers, which they did not remove from the Commons. (*hear, hear*). Let them not assent to this, because they might think it would assist the general measure. Next Session, it was intended to bring forward the whole question of civil disabilities under which the Roman Catholics laboured. Then they would hear from his Right Honorable Friend (Mr. Plunkett) that there were rights inherent in every citizen. If so, then how could they consent to exclude the Commons? Let them only postpone it for four months, and then they would not be chargeable with having abandoned what appeared to him to be the exclusive duty of the House of Representatives. (*loud and long cheering*.)

Mr. WILMOT, explained.

The Marquis of LONDONDERRY and Mr. CANNING rose at the same time, but the latter gave way. The Noble Lord assured his Right Hon. Friend that he would not long detain the House. He merely wished to advert to the general ground of argument assumed in opposing this Bill. This appeared to be, that as they were not prepared for the general measure, they could not consistently consent to a partial one. For his own part, he had from the beginning said, since this measure was first put in agitation, that there was a much greater tendency in the minds of the people towards it. But in proportion as he felt that to be the case, he had wished not to harass their minds on the subject, and he thought there was a more reasonable chance of its success, when brought forward at intervals, rather than year after year.—He always considered that the real question to be resolved on was, the amount of danger to which they became exposed by removing the disabilities under which the Catholics laboured. As to securities, he was one who had always thought that they should be a component part of any measure for that purpose; but he always wished to make them of that nature as should best fall in with the prejudices of the parties. But that branch of the question did not affect this measure. All that was asked on the present occasion was, to permit this partial measure to pass before the general measure connected with the admission of the Catholics to the higher offices of the State, and the Representation, was brought forward upon reasonable securities.—If the question

PARLIAMENTARY.

—221—

turned upon the Oath of Supremacy, and if his Right Honorable Friend (Mr. Peel) would give up his opposition upon that Oath being part of the Bill, he thought there would be no difficulty in coming to an understanding. He had no hesitation in saying that the whole of the Roman Catholics would be content to take the Oath of Supremacy at present on the faith of our laws. With reference to the extent of danger incurred, it appeared that there was no ground to apprehend the addition of more than seven, eight, or nine Members in that House. If he could think that there was any danger to the State, the Constitution, or the Ecclesiastical Power, he would stand on a rock in his opposition. Nor could he admit that it was any argument in favour of this measure, that the original Act of Exclusion was an act of injustice. They were not there to administer justice, but to uphold the Constitution in Church and State. They would come better to the trial of the question next year, having first ascertained the feeling upon this partial measure. He, therefore, thinking there were advantages in moving the partial question this year, although not the general one, gave his support to the Bill.

Mr. CANNING.—If in the course of my reply on a former evening to the observations of my Right Hon. Friend, the Secretary for the Home Department, I saw any thing which conveyed to that Gentleman's mind an idea that I thought he met the question unfairly, I can safely declare, that he has altogether misunderstood my meaning; for however we may disagree upon the great question of which the present motion constitutes a part, I can assure him that it would be impossible for me, either in debating the subject on a wider scale, or confining myself to the limited point now under consideration, to wish for a fairer antagonist. (hear, hear.) If I said that, in answering my argument, he had neglected to touch upon the justice and expediency of the question, I meant the justice and expediency of this particular case, and not the justice of the measure as affecting the whole body of the Roman Catholics. I am sincerely glad that my Noble Friend, who last addressed the House, has interposed between the Right Honorable Gentleman and myself, for in the latter part of his speech he completely developed my views of the policy at least upon which I thought myself warranted in bringing this question forward. It may be useful if Hon. Members will recollect the progress of discussion in this House on the subject of the Catholic Claims. To go no further back than to the period at which the House first entertained this question favourably. I mean the year 1812, it will be recollected that in that year, I succeeded in obtaining from the House a pledge that it would, in the following Session, enter into the consideration of the question, with a view to a general, permanent, and conciliatory arrangement. What was the fate of that Resolution in the House of Lords? Why, that a measure which was intended to emancipate Catholics generally did not meet with their concurrence. In the succeeding year 1813, this House redeemed the pledge which it had given the preceding Session; the whole question was brought under consideration, and a Bill upon the most general scale of emancipation passed thro' its first stages in this House. It has been truly stated this evening that the failure of that bill was occasioned by a particular clause which it was proposed in the Committee to add to it. To that failure, I mean to the throwing up of the Bill when the objectionable clause was carried, I was certainly a party but upon looking back to the proceedings of that day, I am convinced that our decision was a decision not of reason but of temper, and I lament that it ever took place. (hear.) For it will be recollected, that in the course of the debate on that occasion all sorts of concessions were freely offered by those Gentlemen who opposed us, if we could have contented ourselves without the admission of the Catholics to Parliament. Unwisely as I think, imprudently as it must be confessed, we did not close with those concessions, and the consequence was, that for the nine years that followed, the question rested where it was and no advance or advantage was gained. In the last Session, however, the subject was again brought forward under the support of the stupendous abilities of my Right Hon. Friend the Attorney-General of Ireland, and was agreed to by this House. That measure was comprehensive in the highest degree: it embodied every unsettled point, and was at the same time accompanied with such securities as could not fail to satisfy the most scrupulous on that head. What was the immediate consequence of that success?—The measure was again rejected by the other House, and we are now placed in a situation to consider whether in our former attempts we have or have not adopted the course of proceeding most calculated to ensure ultimate success. Those gentlemen who call upon us to adhere to general measures, to general declarations, are only labouring in their vocation, for they are urging us to continue in that course in which we have hitherto uniformly failed.—(hear, hear.) But it is for those who wish us success to consider whether a better chance will not be afforded us by the trial of other means, and I must say, that upon looking back to the last ten years, we have a right to infer from the conduct of those who opposed us in 1812, as well (as I shall presently shew) from the conduct of Parliament itself, that it is from advocating particular measures that we shall be most likely to accomplish our object. For has nothing been done in the interval to which I have al-

luded? Has no part of this great question succeeded since its general failure in 1813? If, Sir, I am not deceived in my recollection, a very considerable concession has been made, and it is worth while to consider where that concession originated. Why, Sir, it originated in the other house. But when this question was upon the former occasion fully discussed, upon what point was the greatest stress laid? First, certainly, upon the admission of Catholics into Parliament and into office; but what next?—why, upon their admission into the army and navy, those professions their exclusion from which they justly regarded as a great grievance. I am old enough in Parliament to remember, that in 1805, a few years after the union, when Mr. Fox brought forward the Catholic question, and supported it by one of his most able and impressive speeches, the point upon which he dwelt most largely was the exclusion of the Catholic soldier from subaltern commissions, and from the other honors of the profession. Yet since that period has there been no approach to the gradual accomplishment of the measure; has there been no partial legislation to remove that particular disability, and has not the measure of admitting the Catholics into the army and navy originated from the Lords themselves, and been only sent down to this House for the purpose of being confirmed? My Hon. and Learned Friend who has objected to the title of my Bill, will allow me to set that title against the title of the Bill in question—that Bill was intitled, "An act for regulating the administration of the oath to be taken by officers in the army and navy." Such was the title. Who could have supposed, that under such a Bill, the whole regulation of the army was overturned and altered? (hear.) My Hon. and Learned Friend objects to the title of my Bill, because, he says, it means little and includes much. I bow with deference to the example which I have followed. I was inclined to think, that if the great and complicated question of Catholic Emancipation were to be brought forward this year, it would meet with the same fate as it experienced last year in the House of Lords. I do not mean that if that general question had been brought forward, I should not have given it, as I have always done, my cordial support, or that I should in that case have dreamt of interfering with any suggestion of my own. But when for reasons of his own, my Right Hon. Friend expressed his intention of postponing it, it did appear to me that a fair opportunity presented itself of bringing forward one branch of the question, and of ascertaining what were the specific objections which we had to apprehend from the other House. Finding every attempt to introduce the general question unsuccessful, I seized an interval, during which the general measure was suspended, to try whether any and what point it was possible to secure. I selected that measure which, morally speaking, I thought had the best chance of success—a measure, the extent of which is immediately defined—one which, as far as public discussion advances the general cause, may advance it, but which cannot possibly furnish an argument against it—and which, so far from being an innovation, is in fact a restoration of ancient practice—one which, if it does affect the other House, approaches it with reverence and respect—and one which, however the Members of the other House might desire it could not originate with them selves; for I presume that they could not, with decency, bring forward a measure which entirely and (as far as the House of Commons is concerned) exclusively benefits themselves.—(hear.) The Bill has no necessary connexion with the general measure: it is perfect and complete in itself. If general fears can be entertained for the success of the general measure, they are not applicable here. If therefore any opposition can be made, it must be made upon the principle, the important unextinguishable principle of the Bill, and on that ground alone can the measure be rejected. But on the other hand, if there is a disposition to concede any thing, let it not be inferred that any danger can accrue from the restoration of Catholic Peers to the integrity of the Peerage, that integrity having been violated through causes which are admitted to have ceased, and circumstances which we never admitted to have been founded upon fraud. (hear.) I cannot conceive any thing resulting from this admission which will affect general question on the part of the other House. They can still say to the advocate of a general admission into Parliament, "You call upon us to sanction a Bill for your admission into the Commons House of Parliament, but first show us the period at which you were wrongfully excluded from doing so, for causes which have now ceased to exist. You call upon us to perform an act of general enfranchisement; but show us that, in so doing, we shall revive suspended right, renew vitiated honour, or restore to an injured posterity those privileges which were originally taken away from their ancestors." In speaking too of anomalies, I would ask the Learned and Honorable Gentleman, whether it is not an anomaly in our present practice that the son of a Catholic Nobleman, who, after a series of splendid services, arrives at the highest military rank, who is entitled from that rank to approach the closet of his Sovereign, should still be excluded from Parliament? I do think that the objection to the particular measure falls to the ground. My hon. and learned Friend has said and rightly said, that it does not necessarily follow that a cause may not be good, because the circumstances upon which it is founded are indefensible. He has truly said

that the enormities in the reign of Henry the Eighth did not vitiate the pure stream of the Reformation. I agree with my learned Friend, and it is on that ground that I agree with him respecting the adoption of the code of laws by which Catholics were excluded at the Revolution which casts no stain upon the Revolution itself. The danger then was not the same as when the Act was passed, but there still remained a danger operating in the same way and leading to the same results; and tho' the law was then no longer necessary for the precise evil for which it was established, yet there were other evils of the same kind to be apprehended. But if my learned Friend does not blame our ancestors for not repealing the law at the Revolution, because there still existed some apprehension against which that law might be useful, I think I have a right to call upon him to show what danger remains to be feared—what apprehensions to be guarded against at the present day I will not ask him to show that there is any fear of a Popish successor—I will not ask him to show that there reigns a Monarch, who takes the sacrament in one day in different communions—I will not bind him to show imminent danger, but I think that he ought to prove some little danger.—(a laugh, and hear,)—that in some corner of history, or in some corner of his imagination, a scintilla of danger exists to justify the continuance of Parliamentary exclusion; and I give my word, that if he will prove this, I will sit down, and relinquish my motion. But my Hon. and Learned Friend has begun his arguments by charging that my history is not new. (laughter.) New! if he had told me that my argument was not new, his proposition would have been plain but I cannot understand what is meant by new history. However, if novelty is so great a recommendation, I advise him to pursue his new history, to find, if possible, some argument for new danger. (a laugh.) But my Honorable Friend went on to state, that in all countries certain guards had been placed, and securities taken, and he asked if Great Britain alone was to be excepted from all restriction. Now I hope I may take the liberty of briefly stating my opinion on the subject of securities. My Right Hon. Friend has truly stated, that the securities introduced into the Bill of last year were an improvement upon my own suggestion in 1813, and I still think that the subject is of the utmost importance, and that this House has an unquestionable right to impose them. But my Honorable Friend has also stated, and also truly, that in my opinion securities ought never to be made a matter of bargain and sale.—(hear, hear, hear.)—I think that no correspondence can safely be carried on with a foreign Power against the existing law without either repealing the law, requiring a security, and I think those who are petitioning for relief have no right to complain if such security is imposed. But is there any relation between that case and the mere restoration of suspended rights? But why should Great Britain be the only Court where securities are not imposed? I will ask the Hon. and Learned Gentleman if nothing has passed in Europe which may seem to leave this country in a state of isolated policy of a very different kind from that which he supposes? Am I deceived, or was it no part of the arrangement of the late peace that the Congress incorporated an Act in the German Confederation by which it was provided that in the whole of the German States religious differences should be no ground for political distinctions? I am told that my Bill is little, and short, and of irrelevant dimension; (a laugh) yet I find that in the Act to which I have alluded, a single stroke of the pen sufficed to give religious emancipation to a population of about 45,000,000. This, too, was in the country which was the scene of the Reformation. I then find that two years after the refusal of the House of Lords to sanction the Catholic Emancipation in England, the King of England sanctioned an arrangement by which disabilities from the religious differences were abolished in a population of nearly 50,000,000. How stands this? The Crown of England sanctioned an arrangement to which the Crown of Hanover is a party? The Crown of England and Hanover united upon the same head may have in Hanover Catholic Ministers. I have been assured, and I mention it for the purpose of contrasting what was with what is, that not many years before, so strictly had the principle of exclusion prevailed, that a menial servant was dismissed from the stables of the Emperor because he was a Protestant; and I find that six years after that event the President of one of the Chambers of Hanover is a Protestant. (hear, hear.) Is not England then insulated, and is that soil, the only one where a slave cannot breathe, also to be the only one where political disqualification is to be founded upon religious difference? (loud cheers.) Is that a distinction of which we ought to be proud? Are we so long to dwell upon negatives in the oaths which we take at that table, that our faith seems to be not in what we believe, but in what we disbelieve, and to be proud of a distinction that makes us worse than all the world besides. The grounds upon which the measure of exclusion is defended, I take it are these—that from the period of the Reformation to the restoration of Charles the Second, there existed a struggle between two contending religions; and from that period to the period when the rigour of the exclusion laws was softened, there still existed some danger of a disputed succession arising from the claims of an exiled family, assisted by hostile States. I presume it is now unnecessary to say, that the first danger has

long since passed away. I presume that it is equally unnecessary to argue, that the right of the exiled individual (whose right could alone cause alarm) is now extinct. I decline arguing the question whether or not and in what degree, the safety of the State ought to prevail over individual interest, and how far a great political necessity ought to authorise the extinction of individual rights. I deny the argument of my Learned Friend who quotes King William as an authority in his favour, and if he will give me the letter from which he read his extract, I promise him not to read the marginal notes—(a laugh)—but I will show him that he very dexterously omitted in reading, a word which he did not omit in copying. (a laugh.) The words, Sir, which he read were these—“His Highness is ready to proceed, though the Clause remains by which Catholics are shut out from both Houses of Parliament, and all employments, civil, ecclesiastic, and military.”—Now, if this authority is good for a part, it is good for all, and as the admission to military offices has been conceded, why should this be brought forward as an argument against the rest? He denied that in that paper there was any thing to show that there was an intention of perpetuating the law. His Right Honorable Friend would have them infer, that all their acts were countenanced, because they were not repealed. The terror of the Revolution was not the period of repeal. William had no right to inquire with exact scrupulosity into the existing statutes. He maintained them as he found them, after a course of warfare, and he used them as a fundamental part of the Constitution, which he came to defend, and which he was sworn to maintain. It would be an unjust reflection on William and his advisers to blame them for not repealing these statutes. Was it possible to imagine that if those great men legislated in these days, and saw their ranks filled with the most loyal Catholics, that they would have maintained such exclusion? Was there not a great difference between the hour of conflict, and the hour when that conflict had ceased? What was the history of the contest during part of Queen Elizabeth's reign? Why, that the Catholic and the Protestant were contesting for the soil, each contending with the other to wed the state, and make it exclusively his own. But the time of combat had passed away. The Catholic now bears to you a willing submission—

“—Vicisti, et victum tendere palmas

“Ansonii videre: tua est Lavinia conjux.

“Ulterius ne tende odium.”

“You,” said the Catholics, “have wedded the state; we no longer pretend to be rivals; we wish to be united with you in friendship; we are willing to live quietly under your reign; we call upon you to deal out an equal measure of justice and mercy towards us.” (cheers) His Right Hon. Friend signed a question of peace in the spirit of conflict.—(loud cheers) The question of rivalry had been decided. The Protestant religion and the Constitution were inseparably united; and all that he asked was, that the subdued party might be allowed to participate in the enjoyment of that happiness which was to be obtained by living under the Constitution of this country, and participating in its privileges. Grant or withhold these privileges to the noble individuals concerned, sure he was that their loyalty would continue equally steady, and they required, he was convinced, no stimulus to that loyalty. But they must calculate upon the average good qualities they found in men, and they could not suppose that these noble persons would go on from age to age with their feelings untouched or injured by perpetual privation. He called upon the House of Commons to make what atonement they could for an age and a half of injustice. He did not call upon them to do an act of justice and humanity, but in maintaining a system which originated in erroneous policy they would act most unjustly. The measure, even though he admitted that at first it might be necessary, was nevertheless harsh at that period, but now it was inhuman. (hear.) He called upon them to redeem themselves from the imputation of adapting their own conduct to that uncharitable and unfeeling principle which they ascribed to the Catholic community.—to redeem their own characters of the shame of suspicion, and to concede a gift which, if given with grace would be received with gratitude, and would tend to cement in one bond of union the people of the Catholic creed with the professors of the Protestant religion. These were the objects of his proposed measure, and he trusted that they would not be solicited in vain. (hear, hear.) The Right Honorable Gentleman sat down amidst universal cheering. There was immediately a general cry of “Question!” and though a Member (we believe Mr. Wilberforce) presented himself to the attention of the House, yet the call became so loud and so protracted that strangers were compelled to withdraw.

During our absence, we understand that Mr. Wilberforce briefly addressed the House in favour of Mr. Canning's motion.

Mr. Baines, if we are rightly informed, opposed the principle of the Right Honorable Gentleman's Bill.

The house divided—Ayes, 235 | Noes, 223 | Majority in favour of Mr. Canning's motion, 12.

The other Orders of the Day having been disposed of, the House adjourned at half-past twelve.

London Gazette.

WHITEHALL, FRIDAY, MAY 10, 1822.

The King has been pleased, by letters patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to grant unto Sir George Naylor, Knight, Clarenceux King of Arms, and Knight of the Royal Hanoverian Guelphic Order, the office of Garter, and the style, liberties, and pre-eminences, belonging to the said office, void by the decease of Sir Isaac Heard, Knight, late Garter.

CARLTON-HOUSE, FRIDAY, MAY 10, 1822.

The King was this day graciously pleased to invest Sir George Naylor, Knight, Garter principal King of Arms, with the gold chains and badge appertaining to the said office of Garter.

Average Price of Corn, by the Quarter, of 8 Winchester Bushels, received in the week ended May 4—Wheat 45s 7d. Barley 17s. 7d. Oats 16s. 5d. Rye 19s. 5d. Beans 21s. 4d. and Peas 22s. 8d.

The Army.

WAR-OFFICE, FRIDAY, MAY 10, 1822.

1st Regiment of Dragoon Guards, Veterinary Surgeon, J. W. Jones, from the 16th Light Dragoons, to be Veterinary Surgeon, vice Spencer, who exchanges. Dated May 2, 1822.

3d Ditto, Assistant Surgeon F. Brown, M.D. from the 22d Foot, to be Assistant Surgeon, vice Williamson, appointed to the Staff. Dated May 2, 1822.

9th Regiment of Light Dragoons, Lieutenant T. Montgomery, from the 16th Light Dragoons, to be Lieut., vice M'Dowall, who exchanges, Dated May 2, 1822.

15th Ditto, Assistant Surgeon S. Jeyes, M. D. to be Surgeon vice J. Easton, who retires upon half-pay. Dated May 2, 1822.

16th Ditto, Colonel F. Newbery, from half-pay 24th Light Dragoons, to be Lieutenant Colonel, vice W. K. Elphinstone, who retires upon half-pay of the Regiment, receiving the difference between the full-pay of Cavalry and the full-pay of Inf.; dated April 25, 1822. Lieut. T. T. Stuart Monteath, from 17th Light Dragoons, vice Graham, who exchanges; dated April 25, 1822; and Lieut. G. M'Dowall, from 9th Light Dragoons, vice Montgomery, who exchanges; dated May 2, 1822. —to be Lieutenants, Veterinary Surgeon G. Spencer, from 1st Dragoon Guards, vice Jones, who exchanges, dated May 2, 1822, to be Veterinary Surgeon.

17th Ditto, Lieut. W. Graham, from the 16th Light Dragoons to be Lieutenant, vice Monteath, who exchanges. Dated April 25, 1822.

3d Regiment of Foot, Captain S. J. Cotton, from half-pay 22d Light Dragoons, to be Captain, vice W. Fowden, who exchanges. Dated May 2, 1822.

9th Ditto, Lieut. A. Fraser, to be Captain without purchase, vice Loftus, deceased. Dated May 2, 1822. Ensign F. P. Clarkson, to be Lieutenant, vice Fraser. Dated May 2, 1822.

29th Ditto, Capt. W. Elliott, to be Major, by purchase, vice Gell, who retires. Dated May 2, 1822. Lieut. A. Richardson to be Captain, by purchase, vice Elliott. Dated May 2, 1822. Ensign J. Davidson to be Lieutenant, by purchase, vice Richardson. Dated May 2, 1822. Gentleman Cadet G. S. Byng, from the Royal Military College, to be Ensign, by purchase, vice Davidson. Dated May 2, 1822.

30th Ditto, Gentleman Cadet H. M. Dixon, from the Royal Military College, to be Ensign, by purchase, vice Gunning appointed to the 52d Foot. Dated April 25, 1822.

33d Ditto, Brevet Major H. B. Hall, from the 55th Foot, to be Captain, vice Furlong, who exchanges. Dated April 25, 1822.

31st Ditto, Ensign W. Childers, late of the 10th Foot, to be Ensign, without purchase, vice Copson, deceased. Dated April 25, 1822.

44th Ditto, Lieut. F. Hawkins, from the 59th Foot, to be Lieutenant, without purchase, vice Short, deceased. Dated April 25, 1822.

49th Ditto, Lieut. W. H. Barker, from half-pay, 25th Foot, to be Lieutenant, vice E. Peel, who exchanges, receiving the difference. Dated May 2, 1822.

50th Ditto, Captain P. Powell, from half-pay, 23d Foot, to be Captain, vice J. Bishop, who exchanges. Dated May 2, 1822.

52d Ditto, Captain J. M'Nair, to be Major, by purchase, vice Rowan, who retires, dated April 25, 1822; Lieutenant Sir W. H. Clerke,

Bart. to be Captain, by purchase, vice M'Nair, dated April 25, 1822; Ensign R. H. Hill, to be Lieutenant, by purchase, vice Clerke, dated April 25, 1822; Ensign W. O. Gunning, from the 30th Foot, to be Ensign, vice Hill, dated April 25, 1822.

57th Ditto, Major E. Lean, from half-pay 2d Ceylon Regiment, to be Major, vice H. MacLaine, who exchanges. Dated May 2, 1822.

58th Ditto, Captain J. Forlong, from the 33d Foot, to be Captain, vice Hall, who exchanges. Dated April 25, 1822.

63d Ditto, Lieutenant-Colonel E. Burke, from the 2d West India Regiment, to be Lieutenant-Colonel, vice O'Hara, who exchanges. Dated May 2, 1822.

78th Ditto, Ensign W. J. P. Gore, from half-pay 57th Foot, to be Ensign, without purchase, vice M'Leod deceased. Dated April 25, 1822.

89th Ditto, Lieutenant E. Worsley, from 60th Foot, to be Lieutenant, vice Hawkins, appointed to the 44th Foot. Dated April 25, 1822; Assistant-Surgeon J. Walsh, from half-pay 10th Royal Veteran Battalion, to be Assistant Surgeon, vice P. Pope, whose appointment has not taken place. Dated April 25, 1822.

90th Ditto, Lieutenant R. Read, from half-pay 61st Foot, to be Lieutenant, vice R. R. Ottley, who exchanges, receiving the difference. Dated April 25, 1822.

Hospital Staff.—Hospital-Assistant J. Sibbald, M. D. vice Napier, deceased. Dated April 25, 1822; and Assistant-Surgeon J. Williamson, M. D. from the 3d Dragoon Guards, to be Assistant Surgeon to the Forces, dated May 2, 1822; and Hospital-Assistant P. Mawry, from half-pay vice Munkittrick, whose appointment has not taken place, to be Hospital-Assistant to the Forces. Dated April 25, 1822.

Memoranda.—The appointment of Lieutenant W. Shaw, from the late 5th Royal Veteran Battalion to the 2d Royal Veteran Battalion, on 25th December last, has not taken place. The exchange between Major Gordon, of the 21st Foot, and Major Lenn on half-pay 3d Ceylon Regiment, as stated in the Gazette of the 30th March last, has not taken place. The Commission of Lieutenant Sherburne, of the 1st Foot, has been ante-dated to 18th Oct. 1820, but he has not been allowed to receive any back pay.

OFFICE OF ORDNANCE, MAY 7. 1822.

Royal Regiment of Artillery, Second Lieutenant W. L. Kaye, to be first Lieutenant; Gentleman Cadet J. H. Humfrey to be Second Lieutenant, and First Lieutenant P. Robinson, from half-pay, to be First Lieutenant, vice Manley, deceased. All dated May 1, 1822.

East India Produce.

LONDON NEW PRICE CURRENT, MAY 14, 1822.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
COFFEE, Java.....	0	120	0	0	140	0
Cheribon.....	0	100	0	0	105	0
Mocha.....	0	180	0	9	320	0
COTTON, Surat, d.	per lb.	0	0	6½	0	0
Bengal.....	0	0	5½	0	0	7
Madras,	0	0	6½	0	0	7½
Bourbon.....	0	0	11	0	1	9
INDIGO, Bengal, blue and violet.....	0	10	3	0	10	2
purple and violet.....	0	9	9	0	10	0
good ditto.....	0	9	9	0	16	0
middling ditto.....	0	9	0	0	9	6
violet and copper.....	0	8	6	0	10	0
good and mid. copper.....	0	8	3	0	9	0
ordinary ditto.....	0	7	3	0	8	0
middling Coromandel,	0	4	6	0	7	6
Madras fine and good,	0	7	6	0	8	3
middling,	0	6	6	0	7	3
ordinary,	0	5	0	0	6	3
SPICES, Cinnamon, 1st quality.....	0	7	6	0	7	9
Cloves, Bourbon.....	0	3	3	0	3	7
Ginger.....	per cwt.	0	12	0	0	16
Pepper black (Company's),	per lb.	0	0	7½	0	0
black privilege,	0	0	7	0	0	7½
white,	0	0	11	0	1	3
SUGAR, fine white.....	0	36	0	0	42	0
middling white,	0	36	0	0	44	0
brown,	0	12	0	0	22	0
SILK, Bengal Skein,	0	15	3	0	16	8
Novi,	0	15	0	0	24	0
Orgazine,	0	0	0	0	0	0
China, Nos. 1 to 3,	0	17	7	0	22	0
SALTPETRE, rough,	0	27	0	0	29	0
refined,	0	33	0	0	34	0

Selections.

Bombay Gazette, August 21.—It will be satisfactory to our friends of the Kirk to learn, that the Court of Directors have sanctioned the appointment of another Minister to each of the Establishments; who, in the event of a vacancy, is to succeed to the senior Chaplaincy.

Our readers in general will also be happy to hear, that the Vellard between this Island and Colabah, which some time ago was commenced, but which was suspended till the pleasure of the Authorities at home was ascertained, has been sanctioned by the Hon'ble Court.

We lately had the satisfaction to announce the appointment of Colonel Waker of this Establishment to the Government of St. Helena, and we now have to state, that he was expected to leave England in July to take charge of his Office.

Durbar at the Government House.—On Friday last the GOVERNOR GENERAL held a Durbar at the Government House. Several Natives of rank were present, and some Vakeels from Native Courts were invested with Khelants. On the evening of the same day, His Highness Prince FUTTA ALLY landed under a salute from the batteries of Fort William. We understand that he is Uncle to the reigning King of Persia, and comes to the British Government on an embassy from the Heir Apparent. Capt MACAN, A. D. C. to the Most Noble the Commander in Chief, has been appointed *Mahmandre* or Interpreter to His Highness. The Ambassador, it is said, is of higher rank than any preceding one who ever came to Calcutta, of which he seemed sufficiently aware, by the anxiety which he expressed respecting certain stipulations for paying and returning visits. The GOVERNOR GENERAL declined entering into any stipulations whatever; upon which His Highness the Ambassador intimated that he would pay his first visit at five o'clock in the evening of Saturday. His Highness set out for the Government House, escorted by a detachment of the Body Guard. On reaching the great entrance, a guard from H. M. 17th Regiment paid him the honors due to his rank. The MARQUESS OF HASTINGS sat in a chair of state in the drawing room, ready to receive him. When the Ambassador arrived at the door of the drawing room, his Lordship rose to receive him, attended by his personal and general Staff, the Garrison staff, the Gentlemen of the House-hold, and the Secretaries of Government, in their dresses of ceremony. The Marquess having embraced the Ambassador three times, led him by the hand up the room, and placed him upon the right side of his chair of state, upon which all the gentlemen present sat down. His Highness the Ambassador is a tall thin man, apparently between forty-five and fifty years of age; has fine large black eyes, and stoops a good deal. He wore a scarlet Cashmere shawl turban, and a loose robe of scarlet. After a quarter of an hour's audience, he retired.—*India Gazette.*

Government has received, we understand, official accounts of Mr. CANNING's appointment, as successor to the MARQUESS OF HASTINGS.

Mr. CANNING was to leave England on the 5th of September in a Frigate preparing for his accommodation at Portsmouth. His Wife and Daughter accompany him.

No Military deaths or Resignations from England have been received by the late Dispatches.

The long-looked for Military Arrangements, we hear, were with the Board of Control.

The Crown Prince and Princess of Denmark had arrived in London, and were met on Waterloo Bridge by the King.

The following Clergymen have been appointed Chaplains on this Establishment.

The Rev. THOMAS WELBY NORTHMORE, A. M.—The Rev FRANCIS THOMAS KIRCHOFFER, A. B.—The Rev. GEORGE WILLIAM CRAUFORD.

The latter gentleman, we hear, is to be Assistant Chaplain at the Old Church.

Mr. JOHN WHEATLEY is coming out to practice as a Barrister in the Supreme Court at this Presidency. We believe he is of considerable standing at the Bar.

The Ships WINCHELSEA, DORSETSHIRE, and COLDSTREAM have been taken up for the purpose of carrying out troops; and of taking home the Regiments which are ordered to return to England. These Ships, are to come direct to Bengal.

Ghazepore.—Extract of a letter from Ghazepore, 8th Sept.—“The Detachment of Recruits, for the European Regt. under the Command of Capt. Morley arrived at this station on the 5th inst. The party has been healthy with the exception of a very few cases. Since the 1st of the month the heat here has been very great, and the River has fallen almost to its lowest. There has been one fatal case of Cholera in the Hospital, the only one for the last three months. The station still continues healthy.”—*John Bull.*

Shipping Arrivals.

CALCUTTA.

Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders	From Whence	Left
Sept. 16	Penelope	French	J. Hillaire	Bourbon	Aug. 10
16	Java	French	P. Saliz	Bourbon	Aug. 3

Nautical Notices.

Letters from the Cape, dated Simon's Town, 4th June, 1822, mention that the *ABERNETHY*, Captain Gilpin, after experiencing a gale of 24 days, was obliged to put into that place on the 22d of May. The Doctor of the Ship died on the 25th of March, and the Revd. Mr. Church, a Passenger from Madras, died on the 24th of April. The Ships *FAME*, (since lost) *KINGSTON*, *ALBION*, and *SOPHIA*, were then all in Simon's Bay, and had experienced the same kind of weather. They were also all much damaged excepting the *ALBION*, which luckily escaped. The *WATERLOO* had been spoken by the *SOPHIA* about a fortnight before this date, and by a Brig only three days previous to it, or on the 1st of June.

Letters from St. Helena dated the 1st of May, mention that the Ship *JUPITER*, Captain Swan, arrived there on the 27th of April. Her passage had been long and boisterous. The Ships *ROSE* and *PRINCESS CHARLOTTE* had arrived there on the 29th of April, and the *WILLIAM MILES*, Captain Beadle, on the 30th of the same month.

Letters from the last named Ship, dated the 2d of May, stated that all were well and happy on board. During a voyage of eleven weeks from Madras, which port she left on the 13th of February, she had not experienced a single hour of bad weather, and all the Passengers were delighted with the comfort of their accommodations, the excellence of their fare, and the kindness of their treatment.

We observe from the late English Papers, that the following Vessels were about to be dispatched for India:—

For Madras and Bengal.—The *PROVIDENCE*, Captain Samuel Owen, to sail from Portsmouth about the 20th of May. The *SIR EDWARD PAGET*, John Gray, R. N. Commander, of 600 tons burden, to sail from Portsmouth the first week in June. The *PHETON* and Free Trader *LARKINS*, for Madras and Bengal, were lying at Spithead, and the latter was to sail immediately.

For Ceylon and Bengal.—The *CITY OF EDINBURGH*, expected time of sailing not mentioned.

For Bombay.—The *JAMES SIBBALD*, Captain James Keith Forbes, and the Ship *BARKWORTH*, John Pedlar, advertised to sail soon; as also the *BOMBAY MERCHANT*, to sail on the 15th of May.

The Dispatches for Madras and Bengal by the *LADY RAFFLES*, were delivered to Captain Coxwell, her Commander, on the 11th of May, and to Captain Chatfield of the *DAFINE*, on the same day.

Births.

On the 5th instant, the Lady of Captain JAMES GREEN, of the Country Service, of a Daughter.

In Park Street, on the 12th instant, the Lady of J. BETTS, Esq. of a Daughter.

On the 14th instant, Mrs. G. S. DICK, of a Son.

At Midnapore, on the 6th instant, Mrs. JOHN D. M. SINAES, of a Daughter.

Deaths.

On board the *FAIRLIE*, on the day of the Ship's arrival at St. Helena, FREDERICK FULLARTON, the Son of Major LEWIS WIGGENA, of the Bengal General Staff, aged 7 years and 3 months.

On the 10th instant, JOHN BRETON, Esq. Compiler of Indexes, in the Office of the Secretary to Government, in the Secret and Political Department.

At Calpee, on the 23d ultimo, Capt. RICHARD CLEMENTS WALKER, of the 29th Regiment Native Infantry, and Superintendent of Civil Buildings at that place.

At Satara, on the 13th of July, of Apoplexy, Major ROBERT A. BROMLEY.

At Colaba, on the 4th ultimo, Mr. JOHN KING, Quarter Master of His Majesty's 47th Regiment, in the 44th year of his age, after a long and severe illness of four months, which he bore with patience and fortitude, leaving a disconsolate widow and daughter to lament their irreparable loss.

